Books by the same author:

AMERICAN NEGRO SLAVE REVOLTS
ESSAYS IN THE HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN NEGRO
NEGRO SLAVE REVOLTS IN THE UNITED STATES, 1526-1860
THE NEGRO IN THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION
THE NEGRO IN THE ABOLITIONIST MOVEMENT
THE NEGRO IN THE CIVIL WAR

The Negro People in America

HERBERT APTHEKER

A CRITIQUE OF GUNNAR MYRDAL'S
"AN AMERICAN DILEMMA"

INTRODUCTION BY DOXEY A. WILKERSON

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS, NEW YORK

COPYRIGHT, 1946, BY
INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS CO., INC.

209

Printed in the United States
of America

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION. By Doxey A. Wilkerson 7

I WHAT IS A DILEMMA? 17

II MYRDAL'S PHILOSOPHY 20

Subjectivism 34

III MYRDAL'S HISTORY 39

A Miscellany of Misinformation 49

IV MYRDAL'S ETHICS 54

V CONCLUSION 66

REFERENCE NOTES 68

FOR BETTINA'S FUTURE

Introduction

This critique of a large and imposing study of the Negro question is published just when the post-war drive of reaction against the Negro people is approaching a stage of crisis.

The wartime fair employment practice program of the Federal government has been repudiated. Poll tax repeal legislation has again been blocked. The War Department has reaffirmed and strengthened the Jim Crow policy of the army.

A police officer in Freeport, Long Island, lined four Negro brothers against a wall and shot them without warrant, killing two veterans, and wounding another. An armed expedition of state and local police in Columbia, Tennessee, angered because Negro citizens repulsed a lynch mob the night before, invaded the Negro section at dawn, guns ablaze, and destroyed every business establishment and almost every home in the area.

A United States Senator and the governor of a state won primary nominations (with assurance of election) on "white supremacy" platforms calling for the disfranchisement and violent oppression of Negro citizens. The Ku Klux Klan rides again. A wave of anti-Negro police brutality is mounting in northern industrial cities. Lynch-terror stalks across the South, and most of its victims are Negro veterans but recently returned from the war.

This whole reactionary trend was horribly dramatized before the world by the planned, cold-blooded murder of two Negro sharecroppers and their wives in Walton County, Georgia, and the killing of another farm worker nearby—a veteran, the lone Negro citizen in Taylor County who defied the Talmadge-inspired campaign of terror and voted in the primary elections. Moreover, hardly a week passes without some new revelation that lynch terror has claimed another Negro victim.

The Negro question has now become one of the most crucial and fundamental issues confronting our nation. Not only are the lives and liberties of fourteen million Negro citizens in dire jeopardy, but the fascist pattern of terror by which they are oppressed threatens to spread and destroy the freedom of all Americans.

Why are the Negro people oppressed? Why is it that now, so soon after mankind's victory over the armed forces of world fascism, the traditional oppression of Negro Americans takes on the virulent pattern of terror so characteristic of the Nazi enemy we have but recently destroyed? These are questions on which there must now be the utmost clarity. They are questions which oppressors of the Negro people try in every way to confuse, but which this important volume by Dr. Herbert Aptheker does very much to explain.

I.

The Negro people are oppressed because the rulers of our society find it highly profitable to oppress them. In terms of fundamental motivations, the explanation of the Negro question is as simple as that; and any effective program for resolving this question must be directed toward destruction of those institutionalized economic, political, and social discriminations which are designed to facilitate and buttress the super-exploitation of Negro workers.

This is a "dangerous" doctrine, of course, for it lays bare the sordid material basis of Negro oppression. If the masses of decent Americans clearly understood that the whole rotten system of anti-Negro discriminations is, fundamentally, a means to superprofits by the owners of our economy, they might be moved to economic and political struggles which would weaken and destroy the vested interests of those landlords, industrial employers, financiers, and their governmental stooges whose wealth and power are based upon this traffic in human misery.

Thus it is that the rulers of our society have found it necessary to invent an elaborate network of myths, stereotypes, and ideologies designed to obscure the real driving power behind the oppression of the Negro people, and to popularize the false belief that anti-Negro prejudices and discriminations arise from alleged inherent inferiorities of the Negro people themselves, or from some unexplained "moral" defect in the personalities of individual white Americans. The "causes" of anti-Negro discrimination are interpreted as almost, if not quite, ineradicable; and the "solution" is said to lie in the long, gradual, never-ending process of "education." In terms of this point of view, the profit seeking foundations of Negro oppression are less vulnerable to attack; and efforts to improve the lot of Negro Americans are channeled into the relatively innocuous task of trying to change the "attitudes"—or the "hearts"—of individuals.

Crude and subtle propaganda designed to gain widespread acceptance of this "safe" view of the Negro question flows constantly from the press and radio, the school and church, the cinema and stage, and from the political hustings. It also abounds in pseudo-scientific literature; and of this there is no more pretentious and dangerous an illustration than Dr. Gunnar Myrdal's two-volume, corporation-financed, so-called "monumental and definitive" study of the Negro in America, published under the highly revealing title, *An American Dilemma.*

This is the study which Aptheker here subjects to thorough and painstaking analysis and evaluation. With fine scholarship, brilliant Marxist insight, and (happily!) a strong sense of righteous indignation, he demonstrates conclusively that the philosophical premises of *An American Dilemma* are superficial and dishonest, its historiography distorted and false, its ethics vicious, and its analysis of the Negro question, "weak, mystical, and dangerous."

If the masses of American people were allowed to learn the true history of their country, or even to understand the economic and political system in which they now live, they would not be misled by *An American Dilemma's* distorted interpretation of the Negro question as a "moral problem." They would know that "the decisive struggle" lies, not "in the heart of the American," as Myrdal would have us believe, but in the market place and factory, on the southern plantation, in the executive offices and legislative chambers of local, state and national government—in the ballot!

They would understand, with Aptheker, that "there is no American dilemma for believers in, and fighters for, democracy and full rights for all people."

If there is anything which the history and contemporary life of America clearly reveal about the Negro question, it is the stark material, profit-seeking core from which all of the varied forms of anti-Negro discrimination and oppression emerge.

The institution of slavery, for example, did not develop because of some previously observed "inferiority" on the part of Negroes, or because the seventeenth century colonists had some peculiar "moral" deficiency. The slave system began and flourished because it was *profitable.* The mercantile traders made good money selling their captured human commodities to southern planters in need of cheap labor; and the planters, especially on the cotton plantations, profited handsomely from an agricultural enterprise manned by workers to whom they did not have to pay wages, and over whose lives they had complete control.

Only *after* slavery proved to be profitable did the myth of "Negro inferiority" gain prominence. Far from being a *cause* of the Negro's enslavement, the doctrine of "white superiority" emerged as an *effect* of the developing slave system. It was consciously invented as an ideological justification and support for a system of human exploitation which was developed to serve purely material interests.

Precisely this same relationship between material interests and Negro oppression exists today. Consider a few dollars-and-cents illustrations.

The per capita annual income of southern Negro tenant farmers and day laborers in 1930 was about $71, as compared with $97 for similar white workers. Multiply this difference of $26 by the 1,205,000 Negro tenants and day laborers on southern farms in 1930, and it is seen that the planters "saved" approximately $31,000,000 by the simple device of paying Negro workers less than they paid white workers. And this does not take into account the added profit from the labor of some 571,000 *unpaid* Negro family workers on southern farms.

The almost universal Negro-white wage differential in southern non-agricultural ocupations is well known. It too makes possible the "saving" of many millions of dollars annually in employers' labor costs.

So likewise in the schools. Southern white public school teachers received an average income of $907 during the 1935-36 school term, as compared with $450 for Negro teachers. On the basis of the 56,000 Negro teachers employed, this Negro-white salary differential aggregated about $25,600,000—money which, with an equalitarian salary scale, would have been paid to Negro professional workers in the public schools.

Consider also that southern white workers—agricultural, industrial, clerical, and professional—are themselves grossly underpaid, and that probably the *main* consideration which makes them tolerate their low wages is the fact that they know comparable Negro workers are paid *even less*. Their position as severely exploited white workers is "superior" to that of the super-exploited Negro workers; so they find it easy to believe that they profit from the Negro's plight. Thus does the system of anti-Negro wage discrimination serve to intensify the exploitation of white workers. Indeed, although there are very real differences in degree, the southern Negro-white wage differential actually operates to the disadvantage of more white workers than Negro workers—for there are many more of them.

There is truly big money involved in this super-exploitation of southern Negro workers. No wonder the rulers of the South use every means possible—political disfranchisement, caste-like social prohibitions, severely limited educational opportunities, "kept" Negro upper-class leaders, and lynch terror—to keep their highly profitable Negro labor force in hand, to force Negro workers to "stay in their place!" No wonder they deluge the white workers with incessant "white supremacy" propaganda and enlist their aid in the oppression of Negroes! If the deluded white workers who join in this anti-Negro program would but realize it, they are, themselves, the unwitting victims of the system of Negro oppression.

These very substantial material interests in the oppression of the Negro people are not confined to the South. The Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, for example, probably rates as the largest owner of agricultural lands in the South; and the corporate profits of this vast financial enterprise are greatly enhanced by the *special* oppression and exploitation to which southern Negro plantation workers are subjected. So it is with scores of other Wall Street concerns which have heavy investments in southern agriculture and industry. That is why they and their Congressional errand boys are among the most implacable and powerful foes of a federal fair employment act, anti-lynching and poll tax repeal legislation. That is why their newspapers and theaters and radios and cinemas persist in efforts to perpetuate the myth of "Negro inferiority." That is why their philanthropies subsidize only those institutions and organizations and investigations and "leaders" which they consider completely "safe" on the Negro question, not at all tainted with "radical" and "trouble-making" beliefs. That is why the roster of contributors to the political campaigns of a Eugene Talmadge and a Theodore Bilbo includes some of the greatest names in American industry and finance.

Northern Big Business has deep profit-making stakes in the oppression of the Negro people; and (although more or less covertly) it is intensely aggressive in its efforts to "keep the Negro in his place."

This profit motivation, of course, does not directly explain all of the *individual* manifestations of anti-Negro prejudice and discrimination on the part of white Americans. But it does explain the basic forces which shape our Jim Crow institutions and culture, which, in turn, set the pattern for individual attitudes and behavior.

II.

The oppression of the Negro people is being greatly in-

tensified since the war because the rulers of our society realize that now they are in grave danger of losing the vested material interests they have in the system of anti-Negro discrimination. In short, more and more, the Negro people have been "getting out of their place," and the virulent pattern of post-war reaction is designed to "put the Negro back in his place."

Under the stress of the war emergency and the ever-growing freedom struggles of the Negro masses, the rulers of our society found it necessary to relax many of the traditional Jim Crow barriers which had served so well to facilitate the super-exploitation of Negro workers. This was true in the armed forces, in war industries, in the Federal civil service, and even in the political and social areas of American life. The Negro people moved forward rapidly during the war; and increasing hundreds of thousands of white allies joined hands with them to strengthen their struggles for full democratic rights.

Set into motion by the powerful progressive currents which the anti-fascist war unleashed upon all mankind, the Negro people have continued during the peace to build and strengthen their national organizations, and to struggle against Jim Crow oppression with a militancy unknown since the days of the Civil War and Reconstruction. Moreover, increasing thousands of progressive white allies, especially in the ranks of organized labor, move actively to support the Negro's struggle toward freedom.

Three major developments have brought this forward movement of the Negro people to a point where the rulers of our economy (and hence of our country) are justly alarmed, especially in the South, lest they now lose those "white supremacy" controls which have paid such rich dividends in the past.

First, the southern Negro masses are exercising their constitutional right to vote. The Supreme Court decision outlawing the traditional "lily-white" Democratic primary elections, which are decisive in the South, gave impetus to tremendously effective register-and-vote campaigns among southern Negroes. Many hundreds of thousands of Negroes who never voted before in their lives placed their names on the registration lists and actually cast their ballots in the Democratic primaries. Moreover, in almost every community where there are greatly increased registrations among Negro citizens, there are also greatly increased registrations among white citizens. Still further, as has been demonstrated in several southern states—notably Alabama, Georgia and Texas—there is a growing tendency for these new voters among the white and Negro masses to join forces in the support of progressive candidates.

Heretofore the exploiters of southern white and Negro workers have been able to consolidate and perpetuate their super-profits by means of their oligarchic political control over southern state and local governments, and through their ever-faithful representatives in Congress. Now that undemocratic political control, together with the profits which it was designed to protect, is seriously threatened by the new and broadened and increasingly democratic southern electorate.

No wonder the Talmadge and Bilbo mountebanks are calilng for the use of every means available, even physical violence, to keep the Negro people away from the polls!

Second, the American labor movement, especially the Congress of Industrial Organizations, has launched a serious campaign to organize the white and Negro workers of the South, and to mobilize them for progressive political action. An effective trade union movement in southern industry and agriculture will mean widespread collective bargaining, higher wage scales and improved working conditions. It will mean increasing unity among white and Negro workers, with consequent weakening of the whole rotten structure of "white supremacy." It will also mean greater power for the political upsurge already under way among the southern white and Negro masses.

No wonder the Ku Klux Klan is being revived as a terroristic counterforce to the growing power of organized labor in the South!

Third, hundreds of thousands of Negro veterans of World War II have returned to their homes in the South fully determined to enjoy those democratic freedoms for which they fought and helped to defeat the fascist enemies of their country. These southern Negro veterans are in the very forefront of the struggle for democratic elections. It is they who most readily embrace the extended hand of organized labor. It is they who are most prone to violate the humiliating Jim Crow customs and laws which seek to perpetuate the subordinate social status of the Negro people.

No wonder the terror of the "white supremacy" police and lynchers is being directed with special violence against the Negro veterans in the South!

The southern Bourbons and their northern imperialist accomplices although still dominant and powerful and dangerous, are justly fearful that their whole elaborate structure of Jim Crow exploitation will crumble under the impact of the progressive forces of the people now moving forward to challenge their rule. They are fighting back with ever increasing fury—just as every exploiting class in history has fought to stem the tide of human progress.

Herein lies the basic explanation of the post-war reign of lynch terror now being let loose upon the Negro people of America. It is a specialized aspect of the even broader postwar reaction against the growing power of organized labor and the working class generally. It is integrally tied up with the mounting imperialist war drive against the upsurge of the democratic people's forces throughout the world. It is counter-revolution in the classic sense of that term.

But let us never forget that the very intensity of this profit-seeking reaction is a measure of the progress being made by the people toward that freedom and security which are, indeed, the "unalienable rights" of all men.

III.

These are some of the insights into the nature and dynamics of the Negro question which one has a right to expect from an honest and competent investigation and analysis of the Negro in America. They are understandings sorely needed to give clarity to the progressive masses of the people, and thus to help consolidate and extend the gains they have already made, and eventually to rout the "white supremacy" and imperialist exploiters of our country and the world. But it is precisely such insights as these that Gunnar Myrdal's ideological monstrosity on the Negro question serves to distort and confuse.

It has truly been said that the most practical thing in the world is a sound theory. In terms of this premise, Herbert Aptheker's theoretical critique of *An American Dilemma* contributes mightily to the practical struggles now gaining momentum for the attainment of full democratic rights and security for Negroes and all other Americans.

DOXEY A. WILKERSON

1. *What Is a Dilemma?*

The annual report for 1938 of the president of the Carnegie Corporation announced that it had "for some time felt the need of a general study of the Negro in the United States." And it was thought to be essential that the "study be made under the direction of a person who would be free [from] presuppositions and emotional charges." Accordingly, the corporation's eyes turned to Sweden and discovered there "a distinguished student," a member of both the faculty of the University of Sweden and of the Senate of Sweden, and an official economic adviser for that government. Thus it was that, commencing in October, 1938, and continuing for a period of about five years, Dr. Gunnar Myrdal, with the help of scores of other learned individuals, conducted the Carnegie study of the American Negro.

The ultimate result appeared in 1944 when Harper issued a two-volume, fifteen-hundred-page, three-quarter-of-a-million-word analysis of the Negro people in America under the title, *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and American Democracy.*

This work has been hailed, almost universally,[1] and quite uncritically, as "undoubtedly the best study of the problem of the Negro in America which has ever been made," "exhaustive and objective analysis," "the most penetrating and important book on our contemporary civilization that has been written."[2] The somewhat ambiguous term "monumental" has been pinned upon it frequently,[3] and quite recently it has been announced that it "is accepted as definitive."[4] It has, moreover, been pointed out that men like Otto Klineberg, Franz Boas, and W. E. B. Du Bois were consulted in connection with it so it is felt certain "that the facts are authentic and the study of the highest calibre."[5] The study has had and continues to have great influence and wide circulation. It has been condensed and issued in pamphlet form by the Public Affairs Committee and by others,[6] and serves as an allegedly authoritative text for innumerable interracial and intercultural clubs, councils, committees, and groups.

From all this praise it is necessary to make vigorous dissent. Not only is it true, as shall be shown, that the work contains numerous and serious misstatements of fact, but it is also true, and this is of crucial importance, that the work—which is meant to be, as Myrdal states, "an analysis, not a description" (p. li)—is based upon a fallacious philosophic concept. This fact vitiates the entire book, and leads one to assert not only that it is not definitive, but that it is vicious.

While it is true that many eminent experts were called upon to assist in the Carnegie study—like Boas, Klineberg and Du Bois—it is not true that they, in their own writings and thinking, tend to agree with the analysis and interpretation of Myrdal. The contrary is the fact, for the distinguished late anthropologist, the social psychologist, and the historian maintain positions on the Negro question directly contrary to that adopted by him whom they advised.

It may be asked whether there is anything of value in the two volumes. The answer is yes, there are some things of value. The book contains interesting and keen insights into the minds of—significantly—middle and upper class whites and Negroes, and apt material on the vested interests in segregation that lead some of the latter to adopt reactionary attitudes generally and even specifically towards the aspirations of their own people (pp. 38-43, 767, 795-97, 1395). Statistical data, as obtained from the census and other official or semi-official sources, on numerous socio-economic aspects of Negro life, are conveniently (though, at times, as shown below, inaccurately) presented (chapters 7, 14, 15, 16, and appendix 6). Even here, however, a reader would do better to go to the work on which this material is based, namely Richard Sterner's *The Negro's Share*. Again, the *description* of the *mechanics* of discrimination is valuable (chapters 24-27) if one cannot find the time to go through Charles S. Johnson's ***Patterns of Segregation*** upon which it is based. But this job of summarization and condensation (marred as it is by too frequent errors) certainly does not warrant hailing the work as definitive, particularly since it forms but a minor portion of the total book, and since it is ensconced in the midst of weak and dubious interpretation.

Pertinent to a critique of the Myrdal work is the question: what is a dilemma? Webster tells us that a dilemma is "a situation involving choice, especially in actions, between equally unsatisfactory alternatives." It is perhaps understandable how an adviser to and an official of the government of Sweden, which treated the late war against fascism as a dilemma and preferred neutrality (especially a neutrality made lucrative by "necessary" trading with Nazi Germany) might decide to christen the fact of the exploitation and oppression of the American Negro people a dilemma—"a situation involving choice . . . between equally unsatisfactory alternatives." Nor is it surprising to find such an individual clearly in error in his own thinking about fascism, so that he writes (p. 1311): "modern fascism and nazism . . . are no more like conservatism than radicalism but could, perhaps, best be characterized as a peculiar blend of reactionism and radicalism."

Let it not be believed that this choice of a title, this label of dilemma, is fortuitous or the result of the misapprehension of a common enough word. In the first place, a title is carefully selected. In the second place, the same word recurs throughout the work (390, 507, 629, 749, 752, 795, 809, 1003, 1319) and is used to characterize the entire ninth and last part of the second volume. And, finally, the philosophy motivating the study leads inevitably to the conclusion that the Negro question is an insoluble problem, and does, indeed, represent a dilemma.

II. *Myrdal's Philosophy*

Myrdal explicitly repudiates a materialist concept of society and adopts that of an idealist. For him, therefore, the status of the American Negro represents a moral problem. The work's introduction is entitled, "The Negro Problem as a Moral Issue." We are told, in italics, that (xliii):

"The American Negro problem is a problem in the heart of the American. . . . This is the central viewpoint of this treatise." It follows from this that: *"What we usually call 'social trends' have their main significance for the Negro's status because of what is in white people's minds. . . . The important changes in the Negro problem do not consist of or have close relations with 'social trends' in the narrower meaning of the term but are made up of changes in people's beliefs and valuations* (998)."

How delightfully nebulous are these phrases, "heart," "mind"! Indeed, Myrdal devotes an entire page to a discussion of the "totally irrational, actually magical belief" (100) behind anti-Negro prejudice. Time after time he refers to "this magical sphere of the white man's mind . . . deep and mystical sense," and finds that he can only lament "the difficulties in expressing it in rational language and explaining it in such a way that it makes sense."

How quickly the commercial press pounced upon these fundamental conclusions! The *New Republic* hastened to agree that "The American Negro problem is a problem in the heart of every American." *Time,* putting it somewhat more pathetically, confessed that "America is continuously struggling for its soul," while David L. Cohn, borrowing the very words of Nazism, says "it is at bottom a blood or sexual problem."[7] The haste ill-concealed the joy to find so pretentious and academically respectable a source fortifying their own circumlocutions. For surely, if the status of the Negro is a problem, and if it is a problem in the heart and mind of every American, and if it is moral in origin, then there can be no solution? And, obviously, there is none, for has it not been labeled a dilemma?

Loud have been the wailings against the dangers of materialism. One who very clearly expressed this bemoaned the alleged fact that in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the purposes of social studies "included the appreciation of culture, training in moral values, and the inspiring love of country." But, in our present degraded era, "we tend to look on an understanding of the political, social, and economic world in which we live as the primary aim of the social studies program." [8] And this leads to a belief in "the need for change. . . . A materialist interpretation of past and present problems presupposes a materialist solution. . . . The door is thus directly opened to the 'isms'" and no longer is there full reliance on "inner authority . . . moral and spiritual principles [and] Divine authority."

Having decided that some unaccountably created morality is fundamental to the American Negro's condition, Myrdal does not fail to present his opinion that the dilemma springs from innumerable, interwoven, interdependent, painfully complicated, equally important "causes." This is inevitable for if the disease is incurable, its origins must be unknown, if not—as Myrdal states some of them are—unknowable. And here we are introduced to the "vicious circle," the "principle of cumulation" theory. As the author remarks (1065) this theory "reappears in every part of the book." Since it does, and since it is so important to an understanding of the work, it is given in full. Myrdal states that "the best formulation of our hypothesis" (1069*n.*) is that given by E. R. Embree of the Julius Rosenwald Fund, as follows[9]:

"There is a vicious circle in caste. At the outset, the despised group is usually inferior in certain of the accepted standards of the controlling class. Being inferior, members of the degraded caste are denied the privileges and opportunities of their fellows and so are more rigorously denied advantages, and so around and around the vicious circle. Even when the movement starts to reverse itself—as it most certainly has in the case of the Negro—there is a desperately long unwinding as a slight increase in good-will gives a little greater chance and this leads to a little higher accomplishment and that to increased respect and so slowly upward toward equality of opportunity, of regard, and of status."

There we have a classic statement of the reformist, liberal bourgeois school of moderation pleaders. The entire paragraph is keyed to gradualness: "desperately long unwinding," "slight increase," "a little greater chance," "a little higher accomplishment," "slowly upward." The theory presupposes an identity of interests and values as between the Negro people and the "accepted standards of the controlling class," and there is no doubt that these standards are the standards not only of the "controlling class," but also of Embree—and of Myrdal. The confusion of the concepts of class and caste is also noteworthy. Observe, too, in terms of bourgeois values, how the exploitation and oppression of the "inferior" group are explained on the basis of the latter's so-called inferiority. It is *because* of their own inferiority that they are "denied the privileges" and this denial accentuates their inferiority, which leads to their being "more rigorously denied advantages." Clear, too, is the mystical quality of the passage, for the crux of the matter, in its own terms, the original "inferiority," and the "desperately long unwinding," the "reversal," are both left unexplained, though these are exactly the items which—assuming for a moment the validity of the analysis—would require explanation. Observe, finally, the absence of "leaps" from this interpretation, the absence of transforming events—mass movements, great and basic alterations, wars, revolutions—an absence which exposes the utter superficiality of the diagnosis.

Each of these characteristics is developed by Myrdal; he does not rest content with merely quoting Embree and with referring about a dozen times to the "vicious circle."[10]

We have referred to the gradualness that is an integral part of the "vicious circle" theory and to the denial of a solution which is implicit in the choice of the word dilemma. These ideas are explicit in Myrdal's work. Thus, at one point, in speaking of his system of multiple causation, in which "there is no 'primary cause' but everything is cause *to* everything else" (78), he finds that "the scientific solution of the Negro problem should thus be given in the form of an interconnected series of quantitative equations, describing the movement of the actual system under various influences. *That this complete, quantitative and truly scientific solution is far beyond the horizon does not need to be pointed out.*" (1069. My emphasis—*H.A.*)

The bourgeois values of Myrdal are also given quite explicitly. He states (929*n*) that to him the terms good and bad are "defined according to our value premise of placing the general American culture 'higher.'"[11] The same bias is apparent in Myrdal's choice of the "friends" of the Negro. To him "the Negro's friend—or the one who is least unfriendly—is still rather the upper class of white people, the people with economic and social security (69)." And in another place Myrdal names one of these upper class people, Edgar G. Murphy, "who is distinguished as one of the most sincere friends of the Negro among the conservative-minded old Southerners (1318)." This individual, a leader in the Alabama movement to overthrow the Reconstruction government and constitution, felt that so far as the Negro was concerned "the spirit of the South has been the spirit of kindliness and helpfulness. . . . The South gives to him the best gift of a civilization to an individual—the opportunity to live industriously and honestly. . . . The South must, of course, secure the supremacy of intelligence and property."[12] Such, to Myrdal, is "one of the most sincere friends of the Negro."

The same type of thinking is evident from his political dynamics. Impulses come from and should come from the upper classes, the so-called enlightened. Thus, Myrdal has the audacity to explain "why the Negroes in the South are getting so much [!], and are gradually getting even more, education" (461), on the basis of the presence somewhere within the marrow of the conservative Southerner of the equalitarian American creed! The facts—that only as a result of a Civil War was the Negro's *legal right* to an education fully established, that the Reconstruction governments fought tooth and nail against these white conservative Southerners in order to realize that right, that these same individuals are responsible for the throttling of Southern education, and that the considerable advances which have been made have been due to organized mass pressure—Negro and white, directed against these same gentlemen—are here ignored and the dynamic cause is ascribed to some progressive kernel seen by Myrdal within the ossified brains of Southern Bourbons![13] But then, is this not perfectly in line with a philosophy which dismisses "social trends" as inconsequential and ascribes all power to "what is in white people's minds" from some unexplained origin?

Again, he asserts that the problem for liberals "appears to be first to lift the masses to security and education and then to work to make them liberal" (73). Ignoring for the moment the materialist conditions here declared by Myrdal himself to be necessary in order to accomplish certain mental innovations, which contradicts his own main thesis (a contradiction that recurs frequently), attention is called to the passivity and clay-like quality ascribed to the "masses." This idea is repeated many times and is typical of the prejudices of the author. Thus, he finds the masses marked by "relative inertia and inarticulateness" and characterizes them as "powerless" and believes an alleged "lack of . . . organized people's movements in America" is "a significant historical fact usually overlooked by American historians" (712-14). Precisely the opposite condition is true. American history consists of demonstrations of the people's efforts, of "organized people's movements," of anything but "inertia" on the part of the masses, and of the efforts of the propertied interests to repress, weather, divert, or vitiate the demands of those masses; while

American historiography, at least until the last generation, consisted very largely of works devoted to describing anything but those same mass movements and impulses.

Myrdal's caricature of the masses in general prepares us for his opinion of the Negro masses in particular. To him (731) "the Negro masses in the South . . . often become . . . so utterly passive that they simply do not care very much for anything except their animal demands and personal security" [14] while elsewhere the reader is told that "a large portion of the Negro masses is . . . utterly apathetic" (732). This slander, and it is but a small part of the vilification flung at the Negro in this work, as we shall see, represents ignorance, if nothing more, so profound as to be amazing. In this connection, while Myrdal does not hesitate to tell us in detail of the desires of the Negro masses, it is significant that he frequently refers to interviews with upper and middle class whites and Negroes, but in not a single instance throughout the two volumes is there mention of any sort of individualized personal contact—let alone interview—with the poor, either Negro or white!

The class bias of Myrdal is so insistent that he does not refrain from making it explicit by pointing out that his position —that of a liberal reformer—is functionally useful, if not vital, to the maintenance of the basic *status quo*. He asserts that it is "urgent . . . from a conservative point of view *to begin allowing the higher strata of the Negro population to participate in the political process as soon as possible, and to push the movement down gradually*." (518-19, italics in original.) This he rationalizes by slander again, asserting that the masses are "less intelligent . . . and most likely to constitute the corrupt" voters. But he warns that "political conservatives, who have been successful for any length of time, have always foreseen impending changes and have put through the needed reforms themselves in time. *By following this tactic they have been able to guard fundamental conservative interests even in the framing of reforms. They have thereby also succeeded in slowing them up; changes have not overwhelmed them as avalanches. They have kept the control and preserved a basis* *for the retention of their political power."* (My emphasis—*H.A.*) Is it not amusing—and revealing—how, when the distinguished doctor recommends action he relaxes his grip upon his philosophic idealism?

Here it may be noted that Myrdal's final and most emphasized bit of advice for Negro leaders is the insulting and petty reformist one of "be honest" and his meaning of honesty is strictly monetary. (857.) This reminds one, in its superficiality and inane quality, of Oswald Garrison Villard's recent serious admonition to the Negro people in which he said that the most important message he had for them, after his fifty years of service, was—be courteous![15] To such insipidness does one descend when one decides that the all-important item in the Negro question is the state of mind of the white man, and of the propertied white man in particular!

This study contains two theoretical propositions, one dealing with the past, the other with the future, and both highly revealing. Myrdal finds the revolutionary liberation of the slaves to have been rather unfortunate, and believes the demands of the Southern masses after the Civil War for the confiscation and redistribution of the land to have been utopian.[16] He regrets (225) that slaveowners were not fully remunerated from Federal funds for their loss of property in Negroes, since preserving "individual property rights to the maximum" is "always of the greatest importance for a smooth readjustment" (note the assumed desideratum—"readjustment"), and believes that much of the land might have been purchased by the government and distributed in small lots (with the state holding the mortgage), and then careful supervision maintained (again by the state) over the new occupiers of the land, who might, in addition, receive *vocational* education.

This proposal—of giving the rebellious slaveholders several billions of dollars (the four million slaves would have brought about three billion dollars at current prices, to say nothing of the value of the land) from the treasury of the government which they had assaulted, and of turning the Negro people into state peons (with the state controlled, unquestionably, by their "best friends," the conservative white Southerner)—

bears a striking resemblance to an actual piece of legislation enacted by another liberal during the period of the American Civil War. We refer to the emancipation of the Russian serfs, by Tsar Alexander II, in 1861, as a result, largely, of mass pressure and unrest.[17] That act, drafted by the Tsar and the gentry, munificently and immediately reimbursed the owners for all serfs (except domestics) and provided for state controlled and limited distribution of the land to the peasants, again with full remuneration to the property holders. The result of all this is well known—the peasants were put "at the mercy" of a greatly enriched moneyed class, and this resulted in "a rural-industrial crisis which, vast of dimensions, and momentous of historical import, waxed, ultimately, to a political crisis through the fact that every branch of popular labor had come to stand more or less fettered and paralyzed with poverty. . . ." [18] The parallel between the proposals of Myrdal and the enactments of the Tsar are certainly striking!

The other proposal—and the only far-reaching one to be found in the work—is put in the form of a "reflection" which this "outside observer of the irrational, inefficient, and cruel American caste system" could not help making. (798-800.) Myrdal expresses surprise that no Negro, and amazement that no white, had put forth a demand for full, complete, legalized, outright—segregation.

See what a vista would open up for a "Negro leader, who really accepted segregation and stopped criticizing it." How boldly he "could face the dominant whites with a number of far-reaching demands!" True, the right to the suffrage would be relinquished, but then one could demand separate representatives and while they would not have a vote in the legislature, they could discuss and petition. And perhaps even separate lower courts might be established, and a "rationally planned policy" of residential segregation might be instituted, and certain "Negro jobs," of the poorest sort, of course, might legally be provided, and—well, what did the ghettos of the tsars and of Hitler have that we might not have! But, Myrdal concludes, it is an "extraordinary thing . . . how the national ethos works, in the short run, as a bar [is there no more concrete bar than the "ethos"?] against clear and constructive thinking toward mitigating the inequalities which, contrary to the American Creed, are inflicted upon a weak group. In the long run, this same Creed might come to save, not only, as now, America's face, but perhaps also its soul." How stupid of the "apathetic masses" to refuse to accept such "clear and constructive thinking" when instead all they retain is a Creed that "might," "perhaps," save so ethereal an item as the nation's "soul"!

Our author expresses his class and philosophic biases negatively as well as positively. That is to say, he hurls his pen against Marxism, explicitly, but his assault is pitifully weak. Of this concept he says it is "a superficial and erroneous notion." (676.) As one would expect from such a notion it has had "practically no" effect on "modern social engineering," (1051*n.*) but yet, and on the other hand, and for some inexplicable reason, during the past generation, this absurd notion "has been so powerful, directly and indirectly, consciously and unconsciously, in American social science thinking generally." (68.) So it has had no effect on social engineering, but it has had powerful repercussions on social science thinking (a fine compliment to the engineers!). The Labor, Socialist, and Communist parties, uprisings, and governments are myths (or, rather mere "social trends," not ideas, and so unimportant), and the Soviet Union, also, is wholly fictitious and of no consequence.

This neglect of the Soviet Union, by the way, is an outstanding characteristic of the Myrdal work. Its practical omission[19] from any work supposedly concerned in broad terms with social questions is inexcusable, but its omission from a book devoted to this particular social question—the oppression of minorities—can only be the result, it would seem, of deliberate perversion. For there we have a land of two hundred million people of almost two hundred different ethnic groups where such oppression once was rampant and institutionalized, but where today it is outlawed and non-existent. The probability that the omission was deliberate is enhanced by the fact that the experts consulted by Myrdal, like Klineberg, Du Bois, and

Boas, repeatedly refer, in their own writings, to the outstanding example of the Soviet Union in terms of ethnic democracy.[20]

Where Myrdal identifies Marxism with any type of mechanistic determinism he is indulging in the crassest type of falsification. (77-78.) This misinterpretation, one of the most prevalent and one of those repeatedly repudiated by Marx and Engels themselves and by innumerable later writers, places in the body of Marxist thought one of the formulations which it particularly labored to refute. For, of course, the essence of Marxism is dialectical and historical materialism, and this is characterized not only by a repudiation of idealism, but also by a repudiation of mechanistic philosophy. Indeed, for Marxism these concepts are two sides of the same coin, namely, metaphysical, unrealistic, non-historic, a priori conjectures having no contact with concrete man living in a concrete world who was being formed and changed by that world at the very moment that he was forming and changing it.[21]

When Myrdal moves from a general discussion of Marxism to a more particularized one he moves from falsification to absurdity. He actually asserts that the Marxist view of history is of "the do-nothing (laissez-faire) variety . . . it is biased in the static and fatalistic direction," that Marx in his writings shows "no interest whatsoever in social planning," that he believed a "natural force . . . caused by trends in technology and production" would bring about political revolution. (1051*n.*) This type of thinking, he says elsewhere, which insists on material causation and stresses the socio-economic organism as fundamental to an understanding of the institutions, mores, and ideas associated with any particular civilization, is not only false but leads to pessimism and defeatism. (1069.)

Now, even Myrdal is forced to note that for men who allegedly created a system favoring a "do-nothing" policy, and contemplating the arrival of utopia without the efforts of human beings, Marx and Engels behaved in a strange way. For while Myrdal does not note the plain fact that all the writings of Marx and Engels are polemical and frequently agitational, that they wrote the *Communist Manifesto* in order to instruct and move mankind, he does note "the interest in social reforms" [!] which these men displayed. While this is a mild way of summarizing the historic work accomplished by the founders of scientific socialism in establishing the laws of social development, one would think that it might have given Myrdal reason to pause. But not so. This "interest in social reforms" is dismissed as the "result of an ideological compromise"!

For Marx and Engels "only conscious organization of social production, in which production and distribution are carried out in a planned way, can lift mankind above the rest of the animal world as regards the social aspect, in the same way that production in general has done this for men in their aspect as species." [22] For Marx and Engels their "view shows that circumstances make men just as much as men make circumstances," and they stated that man "by thus acting on the external world and changing it . . . at the same time changes his own nature. He develops the powers that slumber within him, and subjects them to his own control." [23] Marx and Engels by their personal struggles were not indulging in "an ideological compromise" but were *living* their philosophy.

And Myrdal's ascribing pessimism and defeatism to historical materialism can only be explained as a form of projected and transferred deficiency on his part. The denial of historical materialism leads to hopelessness and impotence. Myrdal himself has already been quoted to the effect that any real solution of what he terms the Negro "problem" is "far beyond the horizon." Others, avowedly affected and explicitly adopting Myrdal's conclusions have reached similar stages of despair.[24]

An outstanding example of this truth is Richard Wright, who, in his recent writings, has insisted that the Negro question is primarily a moral issue. As a result he ridicules the efforts of "both the political Left and the political Right" (such impartiality!) for they, by trying "to change the Negro problem into something that they can control [are] denying the humanity of the Negro." [25] And Cayton and Drake, agreeing with Myrdal that the condition of the Negro represents "essentially a moral problem," conclude that perhaps then "the

Negro question—given the moral flabbiness of America—is incapable of solution." They state this with some show of boldness for they feel it is fashionable and "required to appear cheerful and optimistic."[26]

We need not worry about what is required in fashionable circles. And it is not a question of optimism or pessimism. It is a question of activity or passivity. It is a question of ideology. It is a question of idealism versus materialism. Is the trouble in people's minds and souls, or in the conditions under which people exist? Does the question have its roots in material circumstances? Do the institutions of man shape him, and does man in turn shape those institutions, or, having proclaimed the humanity of man have we simultaneously announced him to be uncontrollable by ourselves?

This charge that we materialists see no hope, this perversion of the truth, flows from the idea that since we declare that in a society where each man is the other's competitor, where, in the words of the artist, William Steig, there is a "lack of grace, order and honesty,"[27] that in an exploiting, class-ridden, finance capitalist society, the institution or the organization itself germinates such diseases as modern racism—that since we see this, it leads us to deny the utility of any but the most radical and thorough-going action.

This is false—just as false as it would be to declare that because we know malaria comes from a germ injected into the bloodstream by a particular mosquito, therefore we do not treat the fever and discomfort of its victims with quinine or atabrine. Of course we treat the symptoms, of course we aid and guard the victims—but we also attack the miasmas from which the disease springs. We urge that the swamps be wiped out and that thus we may destroy the disease-carrying parasites, and we affirm that only this eliminates the scourge.

So precisely in this disease of racism. Certainly we fight against lynching, against the poll tax, against discrimination wherever and whenever it appears. We do this not only because these things are evil, but also because struggling against them educates and unites the people. Of course we fight against the May Quinns and Charles Coughlins and Gerald

Smiths and Theodore Bilbos. Of course we battle to eliminate distortions and vilifications from the textbooks, the press, and the movies. Of course we seek out the historical truth and spread it as widely as we can. We do not ignore the battle of the pen and of the word. But we do not merely point to the symptoms. We do not merely feed quinine to the chilled sufferer. We tell him where the swamp is, we point out the parasitic agent which feeds upon him and attempts to infect his bloodstream.

We do not merely say with another adherent of the Myrdal school, Professor Robert J. Havighurst of the Committee on Human Development of the University of Chicago, that "where a problem is basically a moral problem, it must be recognized and treated as such. . . . We must teach boys and girls that selfishness and hatred and group pride are sins. We must teach adults that selfishness and hatred and group pride take the forms of social discrimination and group prejudice." [28]

But the children know all is not sweetness and light. They know that after the delightful assembly period come the struggles of the street and the worries of the parents. They know that after the graduation ceremonies with their unctuous and pious phrases and resolutions come the battle to exist, the fight for a job, for leisure, for health, for real education, for a decent and creative life. And the adults know that while on Sunday selfishness may be castigated as sinful, on the six other days of the week it is a cardinal necessity for getting along in our society. Such moral suasion with undefined terms and superficial objects, if left as mere words, breeds cynicism, but does not destroy racism.[29]

Do we forget all history—do we forget our own history? Now all (except fascists) are agreed that human slavery is wrong and evil. But this unanimity did not exist a century ago. No, then there was the sharpest disagreement as to the merits or demerits of the system and all sorts of gradations of opinion. Then the dominant political party asserted that attacks upon human slavery were anti-democratic, were attacks upon their freedom—as they were—to hold slaves, and attacks upon their legally recognized property—as they were—a direct assault upon several billions of dollars worth of private property. This was the dominant morality of that epoch and it was dominant not because the people who clung to it were less intelligent than people are today. It was clung to then because it was a morality necessary to and inevitable under the productive system of the period—*i.e.,* a slave society.

There were some people then who considered the question to be a moral one, who thought of the solution only in terms of convincing the slaveholders of the sinfulness of their condition.[30] There were moral suasionists then, too.[31] But, if that was *all* there was we would still be arguing the question and most of our newspapers, judging from their past and present policies, would be upholding the institution.

Said a slaveholder in 1832:

> "This one thing we wish to be understood and remembered —that the Constitution of this state has made Tom, Dick, and Harry *property*—it has made Polly, Nancy, and Molly *property*: and be that property an evil, a curse, or what not, we intend to hold it. Property, which is considered the most valuable by the owners of it, is a nice thing; and for the right thereto, to be called in question by an unphilosophical set of political mountebanks, under the influence of supernatural agency or deceit, is insufferable."[32]

And, said another slaveholder, and future United States Senator, in 1845, speaking to the moral suasionists and commenting upon the bitterness with which they denounced the sin of slaveholding:

> "But if your course was wholly different—if you distilled nectar from your lips and discoursed sweetest music, could you reasonably indulge the hope of accomplishing your object by such means? Nay, supposing that we were all convinced, and thought of Slavery precisely as you do, at what era of moral suasion do you imagine you could prevail on us to give up a thousand millions of dollars in the value of our slaves, and a thousand millions of dollars more in the depreciation

of our lands, in consequence of the want of laborers to cultivate them?"[33]

War terminated the question. When the slavocracy saw its national control threatened and then taken from it by a newly ascendant class—the industrial capitalist allied with the free agricultural West—and when it saw its own internal power under increasing fire from its "mudsill," as it contemptuously referred to the masses, and saw more and more people enlisting under the banners of men and women like Frederick Douglass and Harriet Tubman, it did what dying ruling classes generally do—it attempted a counter-revolution. It resorted to violence and in four years, with the loss of half a million precious young lives, Negro and white, it was crushed. Have we forgotten all this?

SUBJECTIVISM

An integral part of Myrdal's rejection of materialism is his subjectivism, his denial of reality except as it is recognized and felt by individuals. This idea is used, too, to assist in an attempted refutation of one of the basic postulates of Marxism, namely, the reality of the class struggle, and so it may be fittingly examined at this point.

Myrdal denies the existence of class interest, because he says for this to exist, "the assumption must be that they [workers] actually care about each other's welfare, that *they all feel as a group.*" (790.) Again: "If white and black workers do not feel united as a group, there is, of course, no 'common interest.'"(791.) And, in an earlier work he had written concerning this point, "the truth of the statement [of the reality of class interest] is entirely dependent on the subjective factor."[34]

Is there, then, no distinction between class interest and class consciousness? Is there no reality in societal organization itself, but only in how people "feel" about such organization? Is not a vast proportion of all sociological literature for the past fifty years filled with studies of the class content and divisions of our civilization?[35] Has this not been a main concern of psychologists, anthropologists, economists, and historians for the same half century?

And we ask this question: did, or did not, an anti-fascist interest exist in the non-fascist world once that scourge appeared? The enemy was there, very real. The institutions of fascism were in existence and their victims could testify and did testify to their reality. The common enemy of the non-fascist world existed and was very real before an anti-fascist coalition came into being. The anti-fascist interest preceded the anti-fascist consciousness. Consciousness always follows interest. First is the reality, the fact, then appears the idea. He who denies the existence of class interest in the face of the class-consciousness that *does* already exist and in the face of the record of modern history—a record of class struggle—is worshiping the long decomposed corpse of Bishop Berkeley and is denying the world.

It is of some interest to remark at this point the contradictions, in Myrdal's own work, on this position of subjectivism. The contradictions appear when he deals with concrete situations, as they generally do in the work of any idealist when he leaves his dream and returns to actuality. Thus, at one point (216) he notes that economic inequality is maintained "for it is the barrier against social equality." Again, he permits himself to say that "discrimination against Negroes is thus rooted in this tradition of economic exploitation" (208), and that the beliefs associated with racism function so as to "defend interests." (111.) And, in a truly amazing passage, Myrdal remarks that if the Negro and organized labor should become firmly united, "if this were once accomplished and an identification reached with the white laboring masses, it would mean the beginning of a liberation of the Negro soul." (794.) While the metaphysical language here is obscure and unfortunate, what stands out as perfectly clear is the utterly contradictory quality of this remark—and it remains but a remark, it is not developed or repeated[36]—to the entire superstructure of "cumulative causation," "vicious circle," denial of the basic significance of material, actual conditions and social forces, and of the existence of class interest.

Having denied the reality of class interest on subjective grounds, it is natural for Myrdal to minimize what class solidarity, particularly as between Negro and white, has existed and does exist. He declares that "much has been made of even the faintest demonstration of such solidarity" (68), though he does not tell us where or when this exaggeration has occurred.[37] Certainly, he does not intend to "make much" of this, and though he writes that he "has seen how a quick and radical change in racial attitudes has been brought about in some places where the tie of a common organization has materialized" (598-99), and though one should think that such developments would be particularly pertinent to an investigation of an alleged dilemma in the face of exactly that "problem"—the creation of unity—and ought to be described at length, such is not the case, and one is left with the bare and intriguing single sentence.

Precious little space, too, is devoted to the question of whether or not the propertied class recognizes the existence of a working class interest (independent of a consciousness) and deliberately attempts to stifle and prevent displays of solidarity. On this crucial point Myrdal finds that he has room for only this very carefully worded remark: "Plantation owners and employers . . . have at times been observed to tolerate, or even co-operate in, the periodic aggressions of poor whites against Negroes." (598.) Is one being unkind by daring to suggest that history would allow us to make a somewhat bolder characterization, and that if one declared that plantation owners and employers almost always tolerate, frequently co-operate in, and often themselves instigate and provoke "periodic aggressions of poor [and rich] whites against Negroes" he would be very much nearer the truth? And may one point out that these owners and employers have ruled the South for three hundred years with very short interruptions, and that they rule it today and that such social patterns as aggressions against Negroes do exist and *can* exist only with the consent and co-operation of those rulers.

In addition to the preceding, Myrdal positively distorts the facts concerning the attitudes of the laboring class. Thus, he insists that the workers rather than the rich are conservative (33, 398-99), though not only is this contrary to universal observation, but it is also contrary to the findings of scientific inquiries into the actual opinions of American and other workers.[38] These have uniformly shown that the bulk of the Left strength, of all progressive movements, is composed of the poorer classes, while the opposite is true of the well-to-do.

In line with this he also repeatedly asserts that the most violent and pervasive hatred of the Negro is found in the working class, in the poor, while it is the rich and secure who are the least unfriendly. (69, 583, 597-98.) This idea, which is assiduously spread by the propertied groups and has wide currency, is false. And it was declared to be false in a study made by Eugene L. Horowitz *specifically for the Myrdal work*. Horowitz, in surveying the rather scanty scientific studies of the subject, concluded, and so informed Myrdal, that no significant relation had been found between income and attitude toward the Negro.[39] And of even greater significance is the fact that the single large-scale attempt to obtain data on this question, undertaken as a *Fortune* survey in 1939, *at the request of the Carnegie Corporation for the Myrdal study,* found that those with *low* incomes had considerably *less* prejudice than those with high incomes.

Specifically, this study, based upon interviews with about five thousand people from every section of the country, showed that the people with the lowest incomes were those possessing the least prejudice, and that, in terms of percentage, about three times as many of the poor as of the rich had a high regard for the intelligence of the Negro, and about 50 per cent more among the poor than the rich were opposed to segregation.[40]

A varied miscellany of facts tends to confirm this finding. Thus, the good will displayed by the white people of Detroit who actually lived in the same neighborhoods with the Negroes during the rioting of 1943 is well known.[41] Again, studies of public housing projects have shown that real friendship regularly develops among the poorest tenants—Negro and white—and that this goodwill decreases as the income rises, reaching antagonism where the whites are prosperous.[42] And of greatest importance is the whole record of the great success of progressive labor organizations, particularly the C.I.O., in developing comradeship between Negro and white members both in the North and in the South. Especially striking has been the solidarity displayed in recent strikes in the auto, steel, shipping, meat, tobacco, and other industries.[43]

Yet Myrdal chose to ignore the advice of his own expert on this question, to ignore the findings of his own opinion survey and the other facts here cited, and to repeat an ancient cliché founded upon the casual observations of uninformed and generally bigoted individuals. It seems fair to remark that this choice was made because that cliché more aptly fits his own presuppositions concerning class interest and solidarity and the behavior of the masses.

III. *Myrdal's History*

The sword Myrdal has here fashioned as to the absence of class interest and solidarity is two-edged. Its second edge consists in a great exaggeration, amounting to distortion, of the degree of solidarity based on a common color existing between rich and poor whites, notably in the South.

Of this unity he has no doubt, and repeatedly refers to the white South, both in historical and present-day terms, as monolithic in opinion. Thus he holds that "the great majority of whites even outside the slaveholders felt their solidarity with the latter" (444), and he sees an absence of conflict between these classes as characteristic of the South prior to and during the Civil War as well as thereafter. Again, to him, the "undoing as far as possible" of the work of the Reconstruction governments was carried out by the "white South." (223.) And, we are told, this idyllic relationship coincided with a corresponding philosophy for "in the pro-slavery thinking of the ante-bellum South, the Southerners stuck to the American creed *as far as whites were concerned;* in fact, they argued that slavery was necessary in order to establish equality and liberty for the whites." (87, italics in original.)

If one sought a succinct statement of all the historical falsehoods that Bourbon apologists have been industriously spreading for one hundred years, he would find none more apt than the last quoted sentence. In pro-slavery thinking, Southerners (that is, slaveholders) did *not* stick to the American creed—*i.e.*, freedom and equality—and in practice, that is, in implementing and demonstrating their thinking, they did *not* stick to the American creed. Southern rule was (and is) oligarchic and anti-democratic, particularly from about 1825 on, and the leading spokesmen for that rule, like John C. Calhoun, Thomas

Cooper, and Edmund Ruffin, specifically and repeatedly denounced democracy as vicious, evil, and impractical.

It is true that the slaveholders, in their propaganda, labored to convince the non-slaveholders that their interests were identical. It is true that its press continually ground out the message that "arraying the non-slaveholder against the slaveholder . . . is all wrong. The fact that one man owns slaves does not, in the least, injure the man who owns none."[44] It is true that their leading publicists, like J. D. B. DeBow, put out pamphlets on *The Interest in Slavery of the Southern Non-Slaveholder* (Charleston, 1860), and that its politicians attempted to provoke race hatred as an aid in allaying class consciousness. Thus, for example, Senator Albert G. Brown of Mississippi, would declare that non-slaveholders "may have no pecuniary interest in slavery, but they have a social interest at stake that is worth more to them than all the wealth of the Indies."[45] But these publications and these appeals were issued in order to forge white unity; they certainly do not represent proof of that unity's existence.

To the Bourbons, "the mechanics, most of them, are pests to society, dangerous among the slave population, and ever ready to form combinations against the interest of the slaveholder"; and "slaves are constantly associating with low white people, who are not slave owners. Such people are dangerous. . . ."[46] "Free society!" exclaimed a Georgia newspaper in 1856, "we sicken at the name. What is it but a conglomeration of greasy mechanics, filthy operatives, small-fisted farmers, and moon-struck theorists?"[47]

Indeed, a visitor to the South, in 1859, felt that "the slave holder seems to watch more carefully to keep the poor white man in subjection than he does to guard the slaves"[48]; and an official of North Carolina in a state document warned, in 1860, "that there was as much danger from the prejudice existing between rich and poor as between master and slave."[49]

Ideologically speaking, the purpose of the slaveholders' rebellion was the extirpation of the American creed, not only as concerns the Negro, but as concerns all humanity. This was explicitly stated, for example, by Bishop Elliot, speaking at a public gathering in Savannah, early in 1862, when he lamented the fact that America, following its Revolution, had "declared war against all authority. . . . The reason of man was exalted to an impious degree and in the face not only of experience, but of the revealed word of God, all men were declared equal, and man was pronounced capable of self-government. . . . Two greater falsehoods could not have been announced, because the one struck at the whole constitution of civil society as it had ever existed, and because the other denied the fall and corruption of man." [50]

It was the development of increased agitation on the part of non-slaveholding whites prior to the Civil War for the realization of the American creed that played a major part in provoking the desperation that led the slaveholders to take up arms. Said J. H. Taylor, a prominent South Carolinian, in 1850, "the great mass of our poor white population begin to understand that they have rights, and that they, too, are entitled to some of the sympathy which falls upon the suffering. . . . *It is this great upbearing of our masses that we are to fear, so far as our institutions are concerned.*" [51] And, early in 1861, a leading Southern newspaper, observing the growth of the white laboring class and its opposition to the slavocratic pholosophy, declared: "it is to be feared that even in this State [South Carolina], the purest in its slave condition, democracy may gain a foothold, and that here also the contest for existence may be waged between them." [52]

In terms of practice, as concerns the mass of the white people of the South, this anti-democratic philosophy was everywhere implemented. The property qualifications for voting and office-holding, the weighting of the legislatures to favor slaveholding against non-slaveholding counties, the inequitable taxation system falling most heavily on mechanics' tools and least heavily on slaves, the whole system of economic, social, and educational preferment for the possessors of slaves, and the organized, energetic, and partially successful struggles carried on against this system by the non-slaveholding whites is—outside of the response of the Negroes to enslavement—the actual *content* of the South's internal history for the generation preceding the Civil War.

It is because of these struggles that a North Carolina newspaper (Raleigh *Register,* March 27, 1861), editorially expressed a "fear of civil war within the state." It is because of these struggles that a wealthy South Carolinian wrote of his class's counter-revolution: "I do not believe the common people understand it, but whoever waited for the common people when a great movement was to be made? We must make the move and force them to follow."[53] The South's arch-secessionist, Edmund Ruffin of Virginia, knew that the movement was an anti-popular one and confessed to his own diary (April 2, 1861), that the majority of Southern white people "was indisposed to the disruption of the Union," while ex-Governor Richardson of South Carolina himself stated that the Bourbons' delegates who launched the Confederacy at Montgomery, Alabama, knew that this did *not* represent the will of the mass of Southern white people.[54]

This explains the enormous degree of disaffection that plagued the Confederacy and that was so potent a factor in causing its collapse, as modern historiography is more and more demonstrating.[55] And this makes clear the fact that the Negro-white unity which did exist during Reconstruction (contrary to Myrdal's assertions) and which did forge mighty democratic advances (the reports of which, by Negro historians, are not "Quixotic," as Myrdal says [1315]), represents a continuation—and a culmination—of the trends clearly observable in the South two decades before secession.

And when Myrdal says (1316) that the Negroes, following the Civil War, "were suddenly enfranchised," "without their asking for it," (1316), he is showing an ignorance that can only be described as abysmal.[56] When he writes that our textbooks "exaggerate the extent of 'black domination' and deprecate the Negro politicians even more than they deserve" (448) he is indulging in a type of mealy-mouthed tribute to the misinterpreters of Reconstruction that, while perhaps phrased in a less obnoxious manner than their works, is, nevertheless, quite as vicious.[57]

We have attempted to show that Myrdal, in his historical treatment of the South, misrepresents its rulers' ideology and practice, and omits reference to the vital anti-oligarchic efforts of non-slaveholding whites. The remaining important facet of the South's history, and one having the most direct bearing upon his basic subject matter, is the institution of slavery and the response thereto of the Negro people. Here, again, we find the author's work inadequate and inaccurate.

In the body of the text itself there is little to distinguish Myrdal's treatment of Negro slavery from that rendered by Jefferson Davis. The general tenor of the work distinctly gives the impression that the institution was a paternalistic, kindly, and generally efficient one.

Myrdal believes that "there is no doubt that, compared with the contemporary caste system, slavery showed a superior capacity to effectuate economic adjustment, even if the slave owners and not the slaves reaped the profits. Even to many Negroes themselves slavery, again in certain limited respects, was a more advantageous economic arrangement than the precarious caste status into which they were thrown by Emancipation." And he continues: "To the owners, slaves represented valuable property. . . . The slave owner had the same rational economic interest in caring for the material welfare of the slaves, their health and productive standards, as any good proprietor engaged in animal husbandry. As the slaves were his own Negroes in a literal sense, he could develop the same pride, attachment, and even affection which the devoted proprietor-manager is likely to feel toward his own livestock." (222-23.) And, with marked naiveté, the next line reads: "The apologetic literature of the South gave much stress to examples of such paternalistic idyls."

At another point, in summarizing the pro-slavery ideology, he remarks that it stressed the theory that, slaves being property, their owners "could have no other interests than to care to the utmost for their welfare" (443)—a coincidence of views between Myrdal and pro-slavery ideology which is truly striking! This is not all. Some pages further on (531) we are told that "The master was obliged to provide food, clothing, and shelter, and to treat his slaves humanly. To the extent that these regulations were not sanctioned by the master's own economic interests and his feelings for his human property or by community sentiment, they seem not to have been enforced."[58] Still, the reader is told that "without doubt," "humanized views . . . were acted upon most of the time by the majority of slave owners."[59]

The present writer has developed in great detail, elsewhere, a refutation of the arguments presented above, and has presented from extensive contemporary references to actual existing conditions, a picture of slavery which showed it to be wasteful and brutal, degrading and cruel (in an actual physical sense), which showed it to be precisely the opposite of what Myrdal—and avowed pro-slavery apologists—say it was.[60] We shall not repeat this material.

At this point we wish merely to point out the fatal (and highly significant) flaw in the analogy used by Myrdal (and slaveholders) in attempting to present a theoretical consideration excluding the possibility of a pattern of cruelty as being characteristic of slavery. That analogy rests upon the assumption that one may compare, accurately, any two pieces of property, even if they be so different as livestock or an automobile is from a human being.[61]

There are, however, fundamental distinctions between these types of property which bar the validity of mechanistic comparisons. Basic as a distinction is the developed reasoning faculty which leads men, unlike livestock, to compare, plan, hope, yearn, hate, fear; which leads them consciously to seek pleasure and shun pain, to spin dreams and build philosophies and struggle and die for them. Human beings, in fine, or at least many human beings, quite unlike livestock, do possess the glorious urge to improve themselves and their environment. And people who are beaten, branded, sold, degraded, denied a thousand and one privileges they see enjoyed by others will be discontented, will be unhappy, and will plan, or at least think of bettering their lot.

This was the slaveholders' nightmare. This it was that led them to erect theologic, economic, social, and ethnologic justifications for their system, that led them to build a most elaborate machine of physical repression and terrorization.[62] For, and here was another crucial difference, most slaves were owned as investments, not as ornaments or commodities of consumption. Slaves were instruments of production, were means by which men who owned land were able to produce tobacco and rice and sugar and cotton to be sold, on a world market, and to return them a profit. Their existence had no real meaning other than this for their employers. Profit must be gotten from these workers whom the bosses owned no matter what suffering this entailed, and the more profit the better.

When one combines the differences, then, he finds the slaves to have been not inanimate ornaments or beasts of burden, but rather thinking, living commercial investments, rational machines of production. It may be said, therefore, that cruelty was an innate, inextricable part of American Negro slavery, for these peculiar machines, possessed of the unique quality of human beings—reason—*had* to be maltreated, had to be made to suffer physical cruelty, had to be chained and lashed and beaten into producing for another's profit. The latter was the reason for their existence and status, and incorrigibility, protest, disobedience, discontent, rebelliousness were bad in themselves and disastrous as examples. Instead of the slave's value preventing cruelty, it was exactly because of that value, and that greater value he could produce, when forced, that cruelty existed.

It is revealing to examine the single concrete type of data that Myrdal sees fit to offer to substantiate his hypothesis that property interest ruled out, generally speaking, ill treatment and cruelty. He asserts that following the Civil War there "seems to have occurred" a "rise in sickness and death rates" which, he thinks, "bears out the general opinion that the first economic effect of freedom [the devastation of war is of no consequence!] was a decreased level of living for the Negro people." (222.)

Now, what is Myrdal's authority for this alleged "rise in sickness and death rates"? It is a reference to an earlier page of his own work. (142.) So we hasten there and what do we find? We find the assertion that the incidence rate of tuberculosis prior to the Civil War was "considerably higher for whites than for Negroes" and that "it was only after Emancipation that the Negro rate jumped high above that of the white." Thus, the reference is to the alleged facts about one disease and cannot substantiate a conclusion about general "sickness and death rates."

Nor is that all. The source which Myrdal cites (1215) to substantiate his sweeping remark that the tuberculosis rate for whites was "considerably higher" than that for Negroes prior to the Civil War is a study, made by slaveholders, for the one city of Charleston, South Carolina, for a seven-year period, and rather than substantiating his conclusion even for this very limited area and very limited period of time, this study reported the tuberculosis rates for whites and Negroes to be practically identical—268 per 100,000 for whites, 266 per 100,000 for Negroes!

Still we have not completed a presentation of this crass example of perversion of truth. The point raised by the Charleston survey of 1841-48 which was seized upon gleefully by pro-slavery apologists before and after the Civil War and its conclusion, of a *similarity* in tuberculosis rate between Negro and white during the period, was subjected to some critical analysis. This was summarized in an authoritative book, available to Myrdal, and cited by him in other connections (Julian H. Lewis' *The Biology of the Negro*[63]), with the conclusion that the Charleston study was a poor one, that other and better studies had shown a contrary condition (in one case, a U. S. Army surgeon, examining 7,849 escaped slaves in 1865 found 290 cases of tuberculosis!), and that, paraphrasing an early article in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* "tuberculosis during slavery was not rare among Negroes but was common and existed as acute military tuberculosis. It was called 'Negro consumption,' and often the whole slave population of a plantation was wiped out with the disease."[64]

Just as the treatment of slavery by Myrdal is poor, so is his presentation of the Negro's response to that institution. Of the underground railroad he finds space for two passing, parenthetic phrases (578, 860), of many other forms of protest and struggle, as service in the armed forces, the establishment of runaway centers within the South (*i.e.,* activities of the so-called maroons), individual acts of resistance (assassination, arson, sabotage), the purchase of freedom, all of which were persistent phenomena during slavery involving many thousands of people, lighting up the character of the institution and of the slaves, and playing considerable parts in generating and enhancing organized anti-slavery work—for all these not so much as a word.

Though note is taken of the slavery factor as very important in the process culminating in Civil War, the Abolitionist movement is dealt with as follows: confusing it with early nineteenth century gradualistic humanitarian emancipationist sentiment (86); exaggerating the vitality of even this sentiment by repeating (1311) the long-refuted myth about how close the Virginia legislature is supposed to have come to abolishing slavery in its session of 1831-32;[65] and listing the names of some of the leading Negro Abolitionists, like David Ruggles, Henry Highland Garnet, Frederick Douglass, and Harriet Tubman, and stating that "these leaders set the future pattern on which Negroes based their protests. The new pattern consisted of non-violent legal activities." (737.) Did this not appear in what is supposed to be a serious, authentic —let alone definitive—study of the American Negro, it would be farcical rather than tragic. Asserting that Ruggles, a leader in the decidedly illegal Underground Railroad, and that Garnet, another leader in the same "subversive" work and a public advocate of helping the slaves to rebel and gain their freedom, that Frederick Douglass, another Underground Railroad operator, militant Abolitionist and supplier of funds to John Brown, that Harriet Tubman, a personal train of that Railroad who made repeated armed visitations into the South and herself led out of bondage many scores of slaves, inspirer of John Brown and object of a large reward, dead or alive, from the slaveholders—asserting that such people set a pattern of non-violent, legal activities is absolutely absurd and shows not only a profound ignorance concerning the individuals, but also concerning the revolutionary movement—Abolitionism—which they led.[66]

On the vital subject of slave revolts and conspiracies, the slight amount of blowing that Myrdal does is both hot and cold. We find the subject mentioned thrice. Once we are told, in language notable for its restraint, that "Modern research tends to rectify the idea of the extreme submissiveness shown by the American Negro in slavery. . . ." (121.) Again, we are told, in a sentence compounded of contradictions, that "Unusually bad conditions or the rare rise of bellicose Negro leaders would, not infrequently, provoke small spontaneous insurrections." (567.) An insurrection, which is, as the dictionary tells us, "an organized and armed resistance to the established authority," is not "spontaneous," that is, "without special premeditation or distinct determination of will." And how insurrections that occurred "not infrequently" were accompanied by the "rare" appearance of leaders is something only an idealist could understand. On the other hand, still further along (736) the reader is assured that there were "numerous local slave insurrections," which should leave him completely confused, particularly since the examples of such "local" insurrections, mentioned by Myrdal, include those of Gabriel and Vesey, each of which comprised several thousand rebels spread over many counties, and at least in the former case over more than one state—peculiar instances of "local" insurrections!

Finally, as pertains to slave rebellions, is to be noted the fact that the only result Myrdal can discover as issuing from them is that they generally provoked harsh restrictive legislation (736), which is supposed to lend support to a moderate, conciliatory, circumspect policy. It is true that the rebellions led the masters to add further repressive legislation to that already existing.

But this was by no means the only result. In addition, these slave rebellions were important in causing the slaveholders to pass ameliorative laws (as in South Carolina in 1740 and in Louisiana in 1795) setting down certain minima. And while, as has already been pointed out, these minima were very low and were, in large part, probably dead letters, the rebellions did force their enactment. It is further true that these rebellions and fear of others were responsible, to a considerable degree, for numerous state and federal anti-slave-trade laws which did have manifest practical results. These rebellions, and other acts of protest, were important, too, in the enactment of emancipation laws outside of the South. And, above all, these rebellions (as well as other acts of struggle) were important in forcing the question of slavery before the bar of public opinion. They pricked the consciences, as we know from their correspondence, of people like Jefferson and Madison, they helped stimulate anti-slavery feeling among equalitarian religious groups, like the Quakers and early Methodists, and they served to inspire the Abolitionists of all schools of thought, from pacifists like Garrison, to political actionists like Birney, and militants, like old John Brown. And, to this day, the selfless devotion and heroism of the Catos, Gabriels, Bowlers, Veseys, Turners, and hundreds of others named and unnamed, as well as the whites who aided them and suffered for it, like Joseph Wood, George Boxley, and Calvin Fairbanks, have bequeathed to all lovers of liberty a memory that remains green and serves as an inspiration to those who still struggle for full liberation. The death of these martyrs was not in vain. No blow struck for human emancipation is ever wholly lost.

A MISCELLANY OF MISINFORMATION

In addition to the foregoing, there exists, scattered throughout the work, a varied assortment of misstatements of fact or statements of half-truths that are important enough to be noticed before moving into a consideration of a final major sphere of the study, namely, Myrdal's ethics.

A classic example of a half-truth (to be generous) is the remark made in reference to so-called race riots, that "the police have not always been strictly impartial during such incidents." (527.) The reference for this (1337) quotes from a good account of the Detroit outrage, in 1942, when the police mercilessly beat the Negro citizens attempting to enter their homes in a federal housing project instead of arresting the fascist-inspired hoodlums who were forcibly restraining them. Indeed an example of something less than "strictly impartial" behavior![67]

Equally ridiculous, and likewise self-contradicted, is the assertion that "The federal courts, especially the United States Supreme Court, have been traditional guardians of the Negro's rights." (502.) The fact, of course, is that the federal courts and most particularly the Supreme Court have, in the words of Louis B. Boudin,[68] "nullified practically every attempt by Congress to enforce the provisions of" the post-Civil War amendments supposed to guarantee basic citizenship rights to Negroes. Myrdal, himself, on another page (445) stated this, and elsewhere (516, my emphasis, *H. A.*), declares that, as concerns the Negro, "The Supreme Court is, however, seemingly *changing* its attitude . . . [and] is likely to continue in its *new* trend. . . ."

Of a similarly semi-ludicrous nature is the statement that "Congress and the Presidents—even, to a certain extent, the Southern Democrat Wilson and the lily-white Hoover—have usually sought to be fair to Negroes. Negro claims have usually received a sympathetic hearing in Washington" (502), as substantiation of which is offered the failure to confirm Judge Parker to the Supreme Court, and the fact that anti-lynching bills have come, at times, close to passage! So, the nomination of a notorious Negro-hater to the Supreme Court and his rejection by the Senate, after an outraged public opinion, led by Negroes, had forced this, and the fact that for the past twenty-five years so elementary a piece of decency as an anti-lynching bill has not passed Congress are supposed to prove that Congress and "even" Hoover have "usually sought to be fair to Negroes"!

Again, one is amazed to learn that "Negroes did not participate in the settlement of the West." (186.) This is sheer ignorance, and the documented literature proving the opposite is readily accessible.[69] The same remark is sufficient refutation to the assertion (807) that "America has not taken any part" in African imperialism.[70]

It is strange to find that the chief result of the efforts of the Colonization Society was the enactment of laws forbidding the education of Negroes! (805.) Those efforts were the efforts of the slaveholders themselves, and were financed, in large part, by Southern states (as Virginia and Maryland), and laws against educating Negroes were in existence in the eighteenth century, generations before the Society was founded.[71]

A further lamentable lack of historical knowledge is shown in the statement that the doubt that lingered in the mind of Thomas Jefferson as to the innate inferiority of the Negro "marks a high point in the early history of the literature on Negro characteristics." (90.) Not only does this remark completely ignore writings of Negroes who, at that time, denied inferiority, but it ignores the writings of several white people, some fairly prominent, who, usually as a result of close personal contact, also vigorously attacked this theoretical root of racism.[72]

There yet remain several examples of shoddy and careless treatment of material. Early in the work one is informed, for example, that "the Southern whites *as a whole* have about the same income as do Northern whites" (45*n*), but the reference for this (chapter 16) does not, of course, substantiate so patently incorrect a statement. What the data in that chapter show is that the incomes of *urban* Southern whites do not compare very unfavorably with those of urban Northern whites, but the significant fact of the much greater urbanization of the North, together with the higher income of rural Northerners as compared to rural Southerners, make the cited passage from Myrdal quite erroneous.[73]

Certainly, too, the handling of the subject of peonage is anything but clarifying. At one point "there is some debt-peonage left" (248), at another it is being "gradually wiped out" (250), at a third the judiciary is "stamping out peonage" (558), and at a fourth we learn that after all the practice now is "unnecessary"! (559.) Of interest is the fact that the only reference in Myrdal for this practice which still exists, is gradually dying, is being stamped out, and is unnecessary, is (1242) one to the resolution adopted in 1939 by the Georgia Baptist Convention Social Service Committee, meeting in Augusta, to the effect that peonage was terribly widespread and involved more people in its cruelties than had ever been slaves![74]

Of a similar character is the treatment accorded the subject of lynching. That organization, protest, and resistance have greatly reduced the frequency with which this bestial practice is indulged in—in the old-fashioned, semi-legal, Roman holiday, mob manner—is unquestionably and happily true. And when Myrdal points this out, he is correct. There has, however, grown up, within the past generation, an institution that, in a measure, has replaced the old-type lynching bee. This is the practice of what may be called "hush lynching" in which a small group of men (not infrequently officers of the law), without fanfare and without ensuing publicity, simply spirit away an undesirable individual, and either torture or kill him, or both. When Myrdal states (566) that he is "inclined to believe that" this, too, has "been declining," he is almost certainly wrong, and it is pertinent to note that, once again, the references Myrdal cites for this remark (1350) take the opposite point of view, and hold that "hush lynching" is definitely increasing as a pattern of Bourbon repression.[75]

The treatment accorded Henry Ford and his relations with the Negro people is indicative also of the Myrdal pattern of half-truth and obfuscation. In the main body of the work itself one is informed that, at Ford's "Negroes have had a comparatively good position. . . . Henry Ford is known to have the definite policy of letting the Negroes have a fair share of the jobs." (394.) In another part of the work faint indication is given of the fact that an essential element in the Ford policy in the hiring and use of Negro workers was to "put pressure on the workers in . . . matters of labor organization." (Appendix 6, p. 1121.) The kernel of truth in Myrdal's first remark is the fact that Ford did employ, absolutely and relatively, many more Negro workers than any other automobile manufacturer. But omitted was note of the fact that even these workers were almost entirely confined to the worst jobs, in the foundry, and the basic point that their use was intended originally and served as a weapon against labor organization. The cracking of the Ford plants finally in 1941 by the United Automobile Workers—C.I.O. after that union had convinced the Negro workers that it was sincerely anti-Jim Crow, and the tactics of Ford to prevent this and to accentuate racism as a weapon against unionization are clearly established facts that must be presented in any consideration of the relations of Ford and the Negro.[76] Their omission, or relegation to parenthetic remarks in the fine-print section of a bulky work, constitutes a choice of treatment which would seem to justify the charge of deliberate distortion.

It will by now surprise no one to learn that Myrdal's scant treatment of the relations of the Communists and the American Negro is characterized by outright distortion. While even he must admit that the Communists are "the only American group which has in practice offered Negroes full 'social equality' " (508), still he insists that they have no "appreciable following" among them. A little further on this is altered and we are told that "Negroes are so immune against Communism." (510.) To substantiate this idea of immunity a quotation from the late James Weldon Johnson is offered. The paragraph from Johnson, however, preceding the one Myrdal quotes, instead of substantiating the idea of immunity, actually deals with the great attraction which communism—the entire philosophy of Marxism—has for the Negro, and contains an admission from Johnson himself, that it does offer, theoretically at least, a solution to the exploitation of his people, as of all other suppressed masses![77]

IV. *Myrdal's Ethics*

Earlier in this work we have shown that Myrdal's values are those of a pleader for moderation, of a bourgeois liberal reformer, of a member of "His Majesty's Loyal Opposition." We have exemplified this in his concept of the dynamics of politics, of the "real friends" of the Negro, of some of his hind-sight and forward-looking "reflections" and proposals, and we have touched upon his opinions of the masses—apathetic, stupid, easily corrupted.

It is important that this latter aspect of the work—Myrdal's evaluation of the common people, and especially of the Negro—be more fully demonstrated and analyzed.

The main source for Myrdal's evaluation is the work on the subject, done for the Carnegie study by Professor Guy B. Johnson of the University of North Carolina, and summarized by Johnson in a book edited by Professor Otto Klineberg. Professor Johnson, after an exhaustive study of the *literature* on the subject of the traits of the Negro, offers "a descriptive list, based upon a fair degree of consensus, of the interests, habits, and tendencies which might serve to characterize the 'typical' Negro. In so far as it has any validity, it is of course more applicable to the Negro masses than to the minority of highly sophisticated and acculturated Negroes." He insists that he is not offering "a list of 'race' characteristics," but is "boiling down . . . popular notions, common-sense observations, and semiscientific pronouncements with respect to the personality and behavior of the Negro." A fundamental preconception which he avows is the notion that "the stereotypes which a dominant group develops concerning the traits of a subordinate group will be to some extent based upon observable characteristics in the subordinate group, and that while the stereotypes may be permeated with prejudice and with the ideology of inferiority they may still reflect a certain amount of truth. . . ."[78]

Very well. Having started out by accepting the idea of the reality of something labeled an "average" or "typical" Negro; and by adopting the concept of truth as basic to the origins of stereotypes (even those formed by dominant groups in relation to subordinate groups); and by using the literature emanating, in very large part, from that dominant group, and, in toto, from a society based upon that dominance, as a main source for ascertaining the characteristics of the type, we are presented with his traits.

And what do we get? Oh! shades of Bilbo and Rankin—"low intellectual interests . . . low interest in material things . . . line of least resistance in work . . . lack of self-reliance . . . honesty not up to standard . . . high sexual indulgence . . . high emotional tone . . . high interest in 'superstition' . . . high in evidence of . . . drunkenness, fighting, gambling, petty stealing . . . loud talk," in brief, high-toned language to express the most vicious, bigoted, impassioned flights of some filibustering speech drooling from the lips of an intellectual relic of witchcraft days!

That the entire concept of a "typical," "average" Negro or Jew or Pole or Slav or Indian or Chinese runs directly counter to the scientific labors of every anthropologist, psychologist, and social scientist of any repute or acknowledged standing for the past twenty years is here largely ignored. That the thesis of stereotypes as originating from anything approaching scientific fact or truth is untenable, and that careful studies have shown this to be fallacious (particularly where stereotypes reinforce dominant-subordinate status situations) is here omitted.[79]

It must be said, however, for Professor Johnson, that immediately following his list of traits, he added: "The above profile of traits is still far from satisfactory. It contains much that involves personal judgment and it makes rather sweeping statements which disregard class and cultural differences within the Negro group. It is submitted, however, as a basis for further discussion and research, with full knowledge that it is in need of a good deal of revision."

However, the man to whom it was submitted did not agree. In Myrdal's work no further discussion appears and no further research is discernible. And while the compiler of the list professed "full knowledge" that it needed "a good deal of revision," the man for whom it was compiled disagreed, made no revisions, and did not see fit even to offer the reader the precautionary remarks made by Professor Johnson.

No, to Myrdal, as he states in italics *"inferior the Negro really is,* so he shows up even under scientific study." (97.) The only concession he makes to the labors of science is his statement (same page) that this inferiority is not biological, not innate. Yet, even on this point it must be noted that Myrdal's language is most indecisive, as contrasted to the finality with which he passes judgment as to the existence of inferiority. Thus, for example, he declares that present data "make it highly *improbable* that innate differences exist which *are as large* as is popularly assumed and was assumed even by scholars a few decades ago." (147, my emphasis—*H. A.*) Again, after listing some alleged deficiencies displayed by the "average Negro," Myrdal says, "we know that these deficiencies are not inborn in him—*or, in any case, in so significant degree."* (208, My emphasis—*H. A.*)

Concretely, what are the characteristics of Myrdal's "average Negro"?[80] To Myrdal the Negro's "intelligence performance, manners, and morals are lower" (97), he is marked by "ignorance, superstition . . . dirty appearance, disorderly conduct, bad odor and criminality" (1066), he displays "low standards of efficiency [and], reliability" (208), he is "emotional [and] unstable" (783), as well as "more indolent, less punctual, less careful, and generally less efficient." (959.) Other variants of these descriptions occur elsewhere (75, 582, 583), and the alleged fact of the "slightly smaller cranial capacity of the average Negro" (139) is thrown in, though it is confessed, in language weak because of its negative quality, that "no connection has been proved between cranial capacity and mental capacity." (140.)

We have demonstrated the fact that while Myrdal is indecisive on the point of biological or innate inferiority, he does tend to pronounce that particular slander as false. Yet it is, in terms of practical day-to-day relations and immediate issues, not at all fundamental. That is, one who is obsessed with the idea of real inferiority of the Negro will display and possess prejudices and will act and think in accordance with those prejudices regardless of whether or not he attempts to rationalize the origin of the alleged inferiority. This fact is recognized by Myrdal himself, for he writes, "Even people who are modern enough not to regard these traits [as listed above] as biological and permanent find in them reasons to keep Negroes at a social distance!" (583.)

Certainly they do. That is precisely the function of the stereotype. The myth of inferiority exists as a rationalization for and a justification of the entire foul system of Jim-Crowism. But those who believe in it and propagate it, *use it as an explanation for, as a cause of, that Jim-Crowism.*

Myrdal, for example, states that certain individual reactionary wealthy Negroes "sometimes even go so far as to blame the whole caste system on the low standards of behavior of lower class Negroes." (1395.) But, *this is exactly what Myrdal does, not "sometimes," but consistently, throughout his work.* We have already proved this point in our treatment of the Myrdal-Embree doctrine of the "vicious circle." The essential point of that doctrine is that discrimination creates "inferiority" and, in turn, that "inferiority" creates discrimination. The doctrine postulates a circle, so that neither beginning nor end, neither cause nor effect, as such, is discernible.

We are not to be misunderstood. We do not for a moment admit the validity of the Myrdal concept of an "average Negro," nor do we admit the accuracy of the traits he assigns to this mythical entity. We shall examine these in detail shortly. But what we are pointing out is that not only does Myrdal promulgate such poppycock as an "average Negro" possessing reprehensible ethical traits, but he *uses* this straw man to account for, in large part, the very real suffering and deprivations and indignities actually inflicted upon the Negro!

Indeed, though Myrdal, in his obsession with the theory of multiple, equal, cumulative, and, in part, inexplicable and unknowable causes, is at pains to deny greater influence to any single force as compared to any other, and explicitly denies the validity of ascribing anything like a basic quality to any one type of cause, he does select such a cause. And that cause is the Negro's "inferiority"! Thus, he writes:

> "In attempting to understand the motivation of segregation and discrimination, one basic fact to be taken into account, is, of course, that many Negroes, particularly in the South, are poor, uneducated, and deficient in health, morals and manners, and thus not very agreeable as social companions." (582.)

So there we have it! The multiple-causation idealist has found his single "basic" reality causing segregation and discrimination—the "inferior" Negroes do not make "very agreeable social companions." The ultimate difficulty, then, would appear to be nothing but the despicable snobbishness so characteristic of the "superior" rich—and their identification of the condition of poverty, created by their parasitism, with an inferior morality!

Let us examine Myrdal's remark that "even under scientific study" the Negro demonstrates the traits he enumerates. While the last volume of his study contains many, many thousands of words in the reference section, not one of these is devoted to any citation of scientific works to which Myrdal ascribes his characterization. The reason for this is very simple—none exists. Guy B. Johnson, whose work served as Myrdal's source, explicity denies that he was offering "a composite scientific profile," but asserts, rather, that his work was based upon a search of literary material and "personal judgment," which hardly form adequate scientific criteria.

Science refutes the descriptions offered by Myrdal. First, and basically, science, as represented, for example, in the writings of Boas, Benedict, Weltfish, Klineberg, Ashley-Montague, Du Bois, specifically repudiates Myrdal's postulate of an "average Negro," or an average or typical anyone else. Secondly, what scientific studies of Negroes have been made contradict the announced findings of Myrdal. Pertinent here is the conclusion reached by Otto Klineberg, *in a paper prepared for Myrdal* on "Experimental Studies of Negro Personality": "The differences between Negro and white personality as reflected in tests and experiments seem not to be marked."[81]

Let us turn to some of the details. The assertion that "the average Negro" has a "smaller cranial capacity" than the white man has no validity, not only because the concept of an average Negro has no scientific meaning, but also because what studies have been made of relative cranial capacities of individual Negroes and whites lead to the conclusion that the assertion of any difference "is as yet an unproved assumption."[82] The remark about a "bad odor" as being characteristic of the Negro is likewise without foundation. Implicit therein is the idea that the Negro exhibits a distinctive body odor offensive to white people, but this is contrary to the findings of science.[83]

What careful studies have been made of the relative "reliability" or "indolence" of the Negro, in the form, for example, of questionnaires submitted to employers of Negroes, have uniformly resulted in a majority of opinions contrary to those of the stereotype, and contrary to those repeated by Myrdal.[84] It may be added that what little scientific study has been made of the relative "emotional" quality of Negroes as compared to whites has tended likewise to challenge the validity of the stereotype.[85]

Myrdal's remark as to the "lower intelligence performance" of Negroes as compared to whites also represents crass distortion, even though it is later modified by inadequate reference to the effects of different environmental conditions. First, consider the fact that the median score of Negroes on intelligence tests is practically identical with (indeed, slightly higher) than that recorded for some white groups, as Portuguese, Italians, and Mexicans.[86] Second, may be noticed the fact that in several tests, where *environmental conditions were approximately the same,* the scores of Negroes matched, and at times surpassed, those made by whites.[87] Third, remember the fact that where environmental conditions for Negroes may be assumed to be better than those for whites, the former scores have been *higher* than the latter.[88] Fourth, studies have demonstrated, as a rule, that improving environmental conditions improves scores obtained in tests. This has been true, of course, not only of Negroes but of all other peoples. Fifth, the intimate connection between such things as formal education, rapport, and motivation, in all of which Negroes are, generally, at a disadvantage, and scores obtained on intelligence tests, is established without any question.[89] Sixth, the recent experiences of the army in its Special Training Program for functional illiterates, as a result of which tens of thousands of men (including many thousands of Negroes) learned certain basic skills and aptitudes, have presented a shattering blow to the ideas advanced by those who uncritically point to lower scores for Negroes in intelligence tests. For that program, which did not depend upon any momentary test, but involved about eight weeks of learning, and in which teachers were carefully selected, rapport was excellent, motivation was nurtured, expense was not considered, and environmental conditions were good and uniform, resulted in the Negroes doing slightly *better* than the whites.[90]

Of even more fundamental significance, however, than all of the preceding, is the question of the validity of the intelligence tests as scientific instruments of measurement. Klineberg has demonstrated and insisted upon the importance of cultural and environmental factors in explaining and accounting for differences in scores. Another has demonstrated, specifically, the fact that the rural-urban distinction is important, that the intelligence tests were standardized using urban examples, and that, therefore, the results obtained favor urban peoples. In addition, it was demonstrated that a test standardized on rural folk resulted in lower scores for urban examinees.[91] The importance of this for the Negro—so largely rural—is obvious.

And, uniformly, the tests have resulted in lower scores for the poor and higher scores for the middle-class and the rich. An essential reason for this (in addition to the data presented above) is that *the intelligence tests were standardized, using* *white, urban, middle and upper class subjects.* Using the tests, therefore, as measures of some absolute quality labeled "intelligence" is not merely unfair (as those who point to cultural distinctions tend to say), but is absolutely invalid, absolutely unscientific.

This, by the way, was the attitude adopted and expressed by pioneers in intelligence testing. The greatest of these, the French psychologist, Binet, explicitly denounced "some recent philosophers" who supported "the deplorable verdict that the intelligence of an individual is a fixed quantity . . . ," and he, himself, experimentally increased scores made on his tests by the same individuals by changing conditions affecting those individuals.[92] An early American authority recognized that the tests could have validity in terms of ascertaining native ability, only *"when we compare individuals in a group who have had common experiences,"* and that *"Tests are valid only within a group who have had identical or very similar opportunities for gaining familiarity with the materials of the test, and who have not only the same opportunity to learn, but the same desire to learn."*[93] This is why a psychologist recently wrote, after surveying the literature on this question, *"that these tests cannot be used for measuring the capacity of different social levels within our own society* . . . [and that] the mean difference in IQ found to exist between children of the lowest and highest status may be accounted for entirely in environmental terms."[94]

A final point bearing on the validity of the results obtained from these tests may be mentioned. This is the fact that these results are expressed in terms of a quotient (I.Q.) in which the mental score age is divided by the chronological score age. But this mathematical process presupposes that the two scores possess a constant relationship. This basic presupposition "in point of fact does not exist," as a leading psychologist has written very recently.[95]

Thus, we have a situation where mathematical figures derived from a non-existent relationship and based upon measuring instruments standardized upon particular sets of subjects are used to describe levels allegedly attained by differing sets of subjects! And, to confound confusion, these levels are then put forth as marking innate intellectual capabilities of the individuals concerned, which is contrary to the avowed intent of the inventors of the very instruments from which the levels were derived!

So much for a comparison between what science actually holds and what Myrdal gives his readers to believe it holds, as regards alleged traits of a so-called "average Negro."

It is important to observe that this defamation of the Negro people follows naturally from Myrdal's basic postulate of their condition representing a moral problem. He and his disciples think of the question as one of sin, as something in the blood and soul and heart of our people—Negro and white.

What we have here is the assertion that oppression morally degrades the oppressed; that the policy of the exploiter in treating his victims as inferiors is successful, in that by such treatment they do, in fact, become inferior.

This has always been the claim of the ruling class.[96] To the French nobleman, to the Russian boyar, to the English nabob, the peasant or native—the masses—have been creatures to be scorned and despised. To the aristocratic Hamilton, "The people is a great Beast."

And we frequently find so-called liberal—let alone reactionary—intellectuals who agree with them. This deprecation is present, for example, in John Dewey who, in 1924, wrote that:

> "The situation then produces conditions which justify the belief in respective superiority and inferiority. For of course any people held in subjection and to a great disadvantage economically and politically is bound to show the consequences."[97]

Yes, there will be consequences. The masses who are oppressed will have higher sickness and death rates, their formal schooling will be retarded, the percentage of their people behind the bars of the rulers' prisons will be relatively high—of course, all this is true.

But this is oppression, it is not inferiority. The basic integrity of the masses will be untouched. Their aspirations for decency, humanity, justice—for them and of them—will be present. Richard Wright may believe, as he writes, that "one could say of Negro life" as Vachel Lindsay has said in his *Leaden-Eyed:*

> *It is not that they starve, but they starve so dreamlessly . . .*
> *It is not that they die, but they die like sheep.*[98]

But he is wrong. All history shows he is wrong—all life shows he is wrong. All history, all life is composed of the dreams and struggles of the very people who, Wright says, "starve so dreamlessly and die like sheep." Hear the songs, read the poetry, listen to the folktales, study the migrations of the Negro and say he is without dreams! Examine the history of Cato of Stono, Gabriel of Richmond, Vesey of Charleston, Turner of Southampton, Harriet Tubman and Frederick Douglass and say he dies like sheep! What nonsense is this! What slander!

Note how demeaning the masses makes one's withdrawal from them so easy, logical, and proper. If they are indeed apathetic and unappreciative and stupid and unreliable and immoral, who can blame the sensitive soul for leaving their midst? If Negroes really suffer, as Richard Wright says, from a "strange absence of real kindness," if they are "unstable . . . lacking in genuine passion . . . void of great hopes . . . timid . . . bare [of] traditions . . . hollow [in] memories . . . lacking . . . in those intangible sentiments that bind man to man" and filled with "negative confusions . . . flights . . . fears . . . frenzy" should one unduly blame him who dissociates himself from those confusions and flights and fears?[99]

The oppressors, the exploiters, are the morally inferior, the decadent. Their brains have been warped by devotion to the past and the dying, and their hands of humanity have been transformed into knotted fists of hate and fear because they have been clutching the knout in one and the moneybag in the other for lo! these many years! It is such an environment that produces a Joseph Goebbels or a William Randolph Hearst.

Listen to Eugene Grace, President of Bethlehem Steel: "Patriotism is a beautiful sentiment, but it must not be allowed to interfere with our duties to our stockholders."

And Pierre du Pont: "We cannot assent to allowing our own patriotism to interfere with our duties as trustees for our stockholders."

And Alfred Sloan, of General Motors, commenting upon his corporation's dealings with Nazi Germany: "An international business . . . should conduct its business in strictly business terms . . . without regard to political beliefs."

And Charles E. Bedaux, multimillionaire, efficiency expert par excellence, speaking to other business men:

> "A man loves his country. He makes laws for the glory of his flag. He traces the outline of a national ideal he would like to live up to, but his stomach, his needs for trade are essentially international. He is a patriot, and a sincere one, but when his money is concerned, he blissfully commits treason."

This is the man who killed himself during the late war when FBI agents finally set out to arrest him for pro-fascist activities.

And George H. Earle, former Governor of Pennsylvania and recent United States Minister to Austria and Bulgaria, two days before the first meeting of the United Nations' Security Council, "recommended using the atomic bomb against Russia" as his contribution to a cordial atmosphere for that gathering.[100]

Let us recall the beautiful passage in Lincoln Steffens' ***Autobiography*** where he tells us that while he and his friends were observing the Soviets in action, early in the Bolshevik revolution, they were contacted by English agents of counter-revolution, led by the writer, Hugh Walpole. These gentry assumed that Steffens would "function naturally against the revolution" and side with the "crew of instinctive imperialists." But Steffens concludes, "I went back to the . . . Soviets. Watching that mass meeting of delegates was like seeing the historical development of human government out of chaos. One could see that there was good will in man, plenty of it, and that, left to itself, its ideals and purposes were noble. Contempt for man, pessimism, melted away."[101]

For a song of the people, the *Leaden-Eyed* will not do. Rather we sing with the German anti-fascist, Berthold Brecht:

You, on whom the blows are falling
Hear your wounded brothers calling
Weakness gives us strength to lend you
Comrade, come, we shall avenge you
Everything or nothing. All of us or none.[102]

V. *Conclusion*

In summary, we find Myrdal's philosophy to be superficial and erroneous, his historiography demonstrably false, his ethics vicious and, therefore, his analysis weak, mystical, and dangerous.

And we affirm two things: (1) the Negro question is basically a material one, not a moral one. The oppression and super-exploitation of the American Negro—and the prejudice based thereon—exist and are maintained because they were and are profitable and useful to America's propertied interests; and (2) there is no American dilemma for believers in, and fighters for, democracy and full rights for all people.

We do have a situation involving choice, but the alternatives are not equally unsatisfactory. The choice lies between the attempted preservation of our existing exploiting system, which nurtures the oppression of minority peoples, or the introduction of fundamental and vital changes now, and the consequent hastening of the transformation of our society into a pattern of socialism.

The choice lies between, on the one hand, bolstering the status quo, whether by blood or iron, or the perversion, distortion, and watering down of the people's demands, and, on the other hand, assisting in the organized struggle of the labor movement, the farmers, segments of the harassed middle-class, and the vast majority of the Negro people for the acquisition by the latter of complete and absolute social, political, and economic equality.

Specifically, there must be developed a people's mass movement for the immediate outlawry of Jim-Crowism and all other manifestations of bigotry. It is necessary that there be enacted a potent national Fair Employment Practice law, and that this law be enforced. It is necessary that barriers to the full exercise of the right of suffrage be removed, and that all people, regardless of color, creed, or national origin, possess the right to be elected or appointed to any office or position in the country. Inequalities in education, and in the use of any and all facilities and institutions, must be abolished. The struggle against the ghetto and restrictive covenants must be intensified. A serious and uncompromising campaign must be undertaken to force the use of all the resources of the national government to guarantee the Negro people against violence and to insure them full judicial rights. Every vestige of peonage must be thoroughly exposed and extirpated by the concerted effort of all law enforcement agencies in the country and, particularly, by the Federal Department of Justice.

These reforms are on today's order of business. They can be accomplished and they must be accomplished if the forces of reaction are to be met and overcome.

The oppression of the American Negro has served as a stumbling block to the forces of progress and freedom for the entire nation throughout its history. It must no longer be tolerated or permitted. In fighting it we fight not only for the Negro, but for all Americans. And in the fires of this struggle will be forged a comradeship and a unity whose drive towards a peaceful, fruitful, and creative life for humanity will be irresistible.

REFERENCE NOTES

1. There have been exceptions. M. R. Davie, in the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (1944), vol. 233, p. 253, found the "treatise quite thin in its theoretical aspects." Gerald W. Johnson (N. Y. *Herald Tribune,* Aug. 3, 1944), while declaring the book to be "a colossal feat of scholarship accomplished in masterly fashion," still confessed that a doubt lingered as to the validity of its analysis. A similar opinion was expressed by A. Rubin and G. J. Segal in "Race Tensions—a Symptom," in L. Bryson, L. Finkelstein, R. M. MacIver, eds., *Approaches to National Unity* (N. Y., 1945), p. 34. Two good critical analyses are: Leo P. Crespi, "Is Gunnar Myrdal on the Right Track?," *Public Opinion Quarterly* (1945), IX, pp. 201-12; and Oliver C. Cox, "An American Dilemma," *The Journal of Negro Education* (1945), XIV, pp. 132-48.
2. From M. F. Ashley-Montague, *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race* (2nd edit., Columbia University Press, N. Y., 1945), p. 20; *Library Journal,* May, 1944; *Saturday Review of Literature,* Apr. 22, 1944.
3. Henry Steele Commager, in the *American Mercury* (1945), LX, 751; Richard Wright, introduction to *Black Metropolis* (University of Chicago Press, 1945), by Arthur St. Clair Drake and Horace Cayton.
4. Cayton and Drake, *op. cit.,* p. 125. How Cayton and Drake can accept Myrdal as "definitive" and yet disagree with one of his basic tenets, namely his statement that "our class concepts have no other validity than as a conceptual framework" (p. 788), is difficult to understand.
5. J. Saunders Redding in *New Republic* (1944), CX, 384-86.
6. Maxwell S. Stewart, *The Negro in America* (N. Y„ 1944); Samuel S. Wyer, *Digest of Myrdal's "An American Dilemma,"* Columbus, Ohio, Council for Democracy, 1944.
7. See Sterling A. Brown, "Count Us In," R. W. Logan, ed., *What The Negro Wants* (University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1944), p. 325; Leo P. Crespi, *op. cit.* Note the similar remark of the notorious Westbrook Pegler: "We deceive ourselves if we believe that bigotry and intolerance are un-American. Prejudice flows in the blood of humankind and we have never been free of it nor ever will be." Quoted in *A Monthly Summary of Events and Trends in Race Relations* (Nashville), Sept., 1943, I, p. 27.
8. Katherine Smedley, "Moral Forces in American History," *Social Education* (1943), VII, pp. 293-94.

9. E. R. Embree, *Brown Americans* (N. Y., 1931, 1943, The Viking Press, Inc.), p. 200.
10. The idea is repeated very often—pp. 75, 101, 109, 208, 391, 392, 583, 643, 1065*ff*.
11. This is stated notwithstanding the fact that in the introduction (p. xlvi) the reader was assured that he would find no moral judgments, for these "are out of the realm of social science. . . . Our investigation will naturally be an analysis *of* morals and not *in* morals." As a matter of fact, however, the work is filled with moral judgments, all predicated on bourgeois values.
12. Edgar G. Murphy, *Problems of the Present South* (N. Y., 1904), pp. 184-85, 194.
13. Myrdal, himself, using Ralph Bunche's unpublished materials, later (499-500) refers to some of the recent organized political efforts of Southern Negroes which have been directly responsible for educational concessions forced from the rulers.
14. As frequently happens, Myrdal himself later (757) denies this: "Deep down in the most dependent and destitute classes of Negroes in the rural South, the individual Negro of the masses ordinarily keeps a recess in his mind where he harbors the Negro protest."
15. Oswald Garrison Villard, "Strategy of Good Manners," *The Negro Digest*, Jan., 1946.
16. This was utopian because real unity between Negro and white not only did not exist at that time according to Myrdal, but *could* not exist. A consideration of these and other errors in Myrdal's opinions about poor white and Negro relationships will appear later.
17. As the Tsar remarked, it was "better to abolish serfdom from above than to wait till it begins to abolish itself from below," and he asked the gentry "to think of the proper way this can be done." See Bernard Pares, *A History of Russia* (N. Y., 1941), p. 276.
18. B. Pares, *op. cit.*, p. 354; V. O. Kluchevsky, *A History of Russia* (London, 1931), V, p. 276.
19. The Soviet Union is referred to four times in Myrdal's work (807, 1017, 1018, 1401), once to say that it and China will play important roles in the peace; twice to state that it might not "adhere" to white supremacy in case of war between colored and white peoples (!); and once in paraphrasing a Social-Democrat's remark to the effect that "the Soviet Union was a totalitarian country."
20. For example, see Otto Klineberg, *Social Psychology* (N. Y., 1940), p. 396; Franz Boas, *Race and Democratic Society*

(N. Y., 1945), p. 146; W. E. B. Du Bois, *Color and Democracy* (N. Y., 1945), *passim*. In connection with Klineberg, who edited one of the volumes issued by the Carnegie Corporation for its Negro study, it is noteworthy that he, on the basic issue, explictly dissents from Myrdal. Thus, Klineberg says: "the existence of prejudice is not primarily a psychological problem, but a socio-economic one . . . prejudice may be completely eliminated only in a socio-economic system in which one person's success or security is not dependent upon another's failure." *Op. cit.*, pp. 398, 400.

21. See, for example, Marx and Engels, *The German Ideology;* Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy;* Engels, *Anti-Duehring* and *Dialectics of Nature,* Lenin, *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism;* Stalin, *Dialectical and Historical Materialism*. Many later observers have stressed these points: H. Levy, *A Philosophy for a Modern Man* (N. Y., 1938); T. A. Jackson, *Dialectics* N. Y., 1936); Howard Selsam, *Socialism and Ethics* (N. Y., 1943); Vernon Venable, *Human Nature: The Marxian View* N. Y., 1945).
22. Engels, *Dialectics of Nature,* p. 19.
23. *The German Ideology,* p. 29; *Capital* (International Publishers edit.) I, pp. 156-57. For a detailed handling of this point see T. A. Jackson, *op. cit.*, pp. 188-97.
24. For Myrdal's own general pessimism see his "Is American Business Deluding Itself?," *Atlantic Monthly* (Nov., 1944), pp. 51-58. His basic fear is, "If private industry should prove incapable of maintaining full employment, then popular dissatisfaction might result in a really dangerous radicalism."
25. Wright's introduction to Cayton and Drake, *Black Metropolis,* p. xxix.
26. Cayton and Drake, *op. cit.,* pp. 764, 766. The descriptive content of this book is very good, and in direct contradiction with the analysis of Myrdal, Wright—and the authors. See Cayton's letter and this writer's reply in *New Masses,* July 20, 1946.
27. Quoted by Rubin and Segal, *op. cit.*, p. 32.
28 Havighurst, "Education for Intergroup Co-operation" in Bryson, Finkelstein, MacIver, eds., *op. cit.,* p. 402. This stress on "education" per se with no attention to the derivations and controls of educational systems and to the intricate connection between the socio-economic pattern of society and the character of that society's educative process, formal and informal, is present in Myrdal and in others. See the sharp critique of that type of shallow thinking in Robert S. Lynd's review of Barbara Wooten's *Planning for Freedom* in *Politi-*

cal Science Quarterly (1946), LXI, p. 126. Note Marx and Engels, "The class which has the material means of production at its disposal has at the same time control over the means of mental production, so that, thereby, generally speaking, the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are subject to it."—*The German Ideology,* p. 29.

29. See Marx and Engels, ". . . our materialist view . . . does not explain practice in terms of the idea but explains the formation of the idea in terms of practice, and consequently it concludes that mere mental criticism, mere resolution into 'self-consciousness' or transformation into 'apparitions,' 'spectres,' 'fancies' of the forms and product of consciousness are quite incapable of dissolving them, that this task can be accomplished only by the practical overthrow of the actual social relations from which all such idealistic humbug springs. . . ." *The German Ideology*, p. 28. For experimental confirmation of this see Bruno Lasker, *Race Attitudes in Children* (N. Y., 1929), and especially pp. 368-84.
30. Note Wallace Stegner (*One Nation,* Boston, 1945, p. 199), who sees no solution to the Negro "problem" except in "the minds and hearts of white people," and only "if all the South can be convinced" of the evil of discrimination.
31. Their appearance and growth, particularly in the generation prior to the Civil War, are explicable in terms of the appearance and development of socio-economic systems in the North and West contrary and opposed to the dominant plantocratic-merchant capitalist alliance, plus the militant efforts of the Negroes themselves.
32. Richmond *Whig,* Apr. 13, 1832.
33. James Hammond of South Carolina in E. N. Elliot, ed., *Cotton Is King* (Augusta, 1860), pp. 140-41. Hammond was governor (1842-44) and U. S. senator (1857-60).
34. G. Myrdal, *Population: A Problem for Democracy* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge), p. 88. This work, too, abounds in "dilemmas"; see p. 90.
35. One need but cite two passages from the Lynds' classic, *Middletown* (N. Y., 1929, Harcourt, Brace), pp. 21, 24: ". . . as the study progressed it became more and more apparent that the money medium of exchange and the cluster of activities associated with its acquisition drastically condition the other activities of the people," and ". . . it is after all this division into working class and business class that constitutes the outstanding cleavage in Middletown. The mere fact of being born upon one or the other side of the watershed roughly formed by these two groups is the most significant

single cultural factor tending to influence what one does all day long throughout one's life. . . ." This same conclusion is repeated in their *Middletown in Transition* (Harcourt, Brace, N. Y., 1937), *passim*. See also W. L. Warner, R. J. Havighurst, M. B. Loeb, *Who Shall Be Educated?* (Harper, N. Y., 1944), *passim*.

36. On the contrary, at another point (401) while stating that the growth of labor unions "is to the Negroes one of the most significant of all recent changes," he very much moderates this for he thinks it "seems to offer some hope," and he is "inclined to believe that the growth of labor unionism will in the long run favor the Negro."
37. Actually, of course, existing literature, particularly historical, is marked by a general failure to deal with the quite frequent instances of such solidarity.
38. Reference is had to the findings of E. A. Rundquist, R. F. Sletto, B. Zawadski, and others, as well as to the Lynds' works already cited. See Daniel Katz and R. L. Schank, *Social Psychology* (N. Y., 1938), pp. 114-16, and Warren, Havighurst, Loeb, *op. cit.*, p. 23.
39. E. L. Horowitz, "Race Attitudes," in O. Klineberg, ed., *Characteristics of the American Negro* (Harper, N. Y., 1944), pp. 222-25.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 226.
41. A. M. Lee and N. D. Humphrey, *Race Riot* (N. Y., 1943), p. 17.
42. See Helen Lynd, *Field Work in College Education* (N. Y., 1945), pp. 198-204; and C. S. Johnson, *To Stem This Tide* (Boston, 1943), p. 61. For further evidence see John Dollard, *Caste and Class in Southern Town* (New Haven, 1937), pp. 76-77.
43. See Ira N. Brophy, "The Luxury of Anti-Negro Prejudice," *The Public Opinion Quarterly* (1945-46), IX, pp. 456-66; Lucy R. Mason, "The CIO and the Negro in the South," *The Journal of Negro Education* (1945), XIV, pp. 552-61; R. C. Weaver, *Negro Labor* (N. Y., 1946), pp. 129-30, 220-23.
44. Charlotte, N. C., *Western Democrat,* June 12, 1860.
45. J. B. Ranck, *Albert G. Brown* (N. Y., 1937), p. 147. See also W. G. Bean, in *North Carolina Historical Review* (1935), XII, p. 115.
46. Unnamed South Carolina newspaper of the 1850's quoted by F. L. Olmsted, *A Journey to the Seaboard Slave States* (N. Y., 1904), II, pp. 149-50; Mobile, Alabama, *Mercury,* quoted in N. Y. *Daily Tribune,* Jan. 8, 1861.

47. Muskogee *Herald,* quoted in A. C. Cole, *The Irrepressible Conflict* (N. Y., 1934), following title page.
48. J. S. Abbott, *South and North* (N. Y., 1860), pp. 150-51.
49. G. G. Johnson, *Ante-Bellum North Carolina* (Chapel Hill, 1937), p. 78.
50. W. S. Jenkins, *Pro-Slavery Thought in the Old South* (Chapel Hill, 1935), p. 240.
51. *De Bow's Review* (New Orleans), Jan., 1850, VIII, p. 25, emphases in original.
52. Charleston *Mercury,* Feb. 13, 1861, quoted in *Political Science Quarterly* (1907), XXII, p. 428*n.*
53. A. P. Aldrich, quoted by L. A. White, *Robert B. Rhett* (N. Y., 1931), p. 177*n.*
54. White, *op. cit.,* p. 202; A. Craven, *The Repressible Conflict* (University, La., 1939), p. 5.
55. See the following: Ella Lonn, *Desertion During the Civil War* (N. Y., 1928); Roger W. Shugg, *Origins of Class Struggle in Louisiana* (University, La., 1939); G. L. Tatum, *Disloyalty in the Confederacy* (Chapel Hill, 1934); Albert B. Moore, *Conscription and Conflict in the Confederacy* (N. Y., 1924); H. M. Bond, *Negro Education in Alabama* (Washington, 1939); Olive T. Stone, "Agrarian Conflict in Alabama," unpublished doctor's thesis in sociology, University of North Carolina, 1939; John K. Bettersworth, *Confederate Mississippi* (University, La., 1943); Herbert Aptheker, *The Negro in the Civil War* (N. Y., 1938); B. I. Wiley, *The Plain People of the Confederacy* (University, La., 1944).
56. The Negro people actively demanded the right to vote right after the Civil War—see on this, Herbert Aptheker, "South Carolina Negro Conventions, 1865," *The Journal of Negro History* (1946), XXXI, pp. 91-97, and sources there cited. Myrdal cites Louis Hacker as one who has "given a history of Reconstruction that corresponds with the facts." (1315.) Hacker's remarks on Reconstruction (*The Triumph of American Capitalism,* N. Y., 1940, pp. 342-81), based very largely, and explicitly on the work of Du Bois, certainly represents an improvement over the Dunning-Fleming school of mythology. Hacker's work is seriously at fault, however, when he deals with the Johnson legislatures in the South as being "dominated by white yeomen" (p. 376); they were dominated by the same cliques and the same personalities as those which had dominated the Secession legislatures. It is not without significance that the work of the Marxist, James S. Allen, *Reconstruction, The Battle for Democracy* (N. Y., 1937), which preceded Hacker's by several years and is based on a

study of primary sources, and contains a profound analysis of the period, is not mentioned by Myrdal.

57. It is of some interest to observe that the Negro-white unity in the South during the Populist period, which recently has received some notice (as in C. Vann Woodward, *Tom Watson* (N. Y., 1938, pp. 220-40), passed unnoticed and unremarked in Myrdal's enormous treatise.

58. The implications to be derived from Myrdal's remark that laws existed compelling slaveholders to provide their slaves with the necessities of life and to treat them "humanly" are deceiving. Certain areas during certain periods did enact laws (at times, quite vague) prescribing certain very basic minima for slaves. These generally came—and this point is utterly neglected by Myrdal—as a result of slave rebelliousness, as occurred in South Carolina in 1740 and in Louisiana in 1795. The minima, however, consisted of such regulations as that for South Carolina providing that slaves were not to work in the fields more than fourteen hours in the winter and sixteen hours in the summer! No agencies of enforcement were established, and no record of attempts to implement this enactment appears. As to requirements of "humane" treatment, these did not exist. Legal punishments explicitly allowed slaveholders were bestial and barbaric. In addition, masters could kill slaves who "resisted," and only a white person could testify in court; moreover, Southern courts generally held that "the master's power must be absolute." Slaveowners certainly were not "obliged . . . to treat slaves humanly." See Herbert Aptheker, *American Negro Slave Revolts* (N. Y., 1943).

59. Yet, in the footnote appended to this remark (1338) which presumably is supposed to substantiate the text, a statement is quoted from W. J. Cash's *The Mind of the South* to the effect that "slavery was inescapably brutal and ugly." Such conflict between statements and references purporting to support them recur. Some already have been observed, and others will be noticed later.

60. Herbert Aptheker, *op. cit.,* especially pages 53-139.

61. The use of this analogy is common in pro-slavery writing, and frequently reappears in later literature. As an example see Stewart Mitchell, *Horatio Seymour* (Cambridge, 1938), p. 103.

62. For the slavocracy's machinery of control, see Herbert Aptheker, *op. cit.,* pp. 53-78.

63. Published in Chicago, 1942; see p. 117.

64. Article by Campbell, 1896, XXVII, p. 1188.

65. The facts on the one-vote legend may be found in Herbert

Aptheker, *op. cit.,* pp. 317-18. Something *not* pointed out by Myrdal about these Virginia slavery debates is that they were precipitated by a slave rebellion, that of Nat Turner, one of the results of rebellions significantly overlooked in this work. See above, note 58.

66. This shallow comprehension of the character of Abolitionism is present in Myrdal's comparing the Abolitionists' refusal to obey the laws of the slavocracy—as assisting in the return of fugitive slaves ("dangerous to democracy" is how he characterizes this—p. 16) with the present disregard of fundamental legal rights by the rulers of the South. This is a completely mechanistic, legalistic, lifeless analysis. Incidentally, in attempting to trace the historical roots of the South's lawlessness Myrdal finds only its rural and frontier features as important, features present elsewhere without the continuance of a pattern of illegality. The basic point of the attempted dehumanization of the Negro as fundamental to this pattern, as exemplified in such practical things as the fact that Negroes could not testify, under oath, in a Southern court of law, is completely overlooked. See Charles S. Sydnor, "The Southerner and the Laws," *The Journal of Southern History* (1940), VI, pp. 3-23.

67. The fact is that American police have been notoriously anti-Negro and that their prejudices appear as prominent features of almost all so-called "race riots." Exceptions, as in Harlem in 1943, only prove the rule.

68. L. B. Boudin, "The Supreme Court and Civil Rights," *Science & Society* (1937), I, p. 302. See also J. M. Mecklin, *Democracy and Race Friction* (N. Y., 1914), p. 231.

69. See D. L. Beasley in *The Journal of Negro History* (1918), III, pp. 33-54; D. L. Beasley, *The Negro Trail Blazers of California* (Los Angeles, 1919); J. F. Rippy, in *The Journal of Negro History* (1921), VI, pp. 183-89; W. S. Savage in *ibid.* (1928), XIII, pp. 255-64, and (1940), XXV, pp. 531-39; C. G. Woodson, *The Negro in Our History* (Washington, 1941), pp. 259-61.

70. For a recent account see Arthur I. Hayman and Harold Preece, *Lighting Up Africa* (N. Y., 1943). The standard work is R. L. Buell, *The Native Problem in Africa* (N. Y., 1928) II, pp. 800-52.

71. Myrdal correctly points out the early existence of these laws (887). On the Colonization Society see Herbert Aptheker, *op. cit.,* pp. 368-69, and sources therein cited.

72. See Herbert Aptheker, *Essays in the History of the American Negro* (N. Y., 1945), p. 142; Herbert Aptheker, "The Quak-

ers and Negro Slavery," *The Journal of Negro History* (1940), XXV, p. 347; C. G. Woodson, *The Education of the Negro Prior to 1861* (N. Y., 1915), p. 68.

73. See *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1944-45* (Washington, 1945), pp. 406-14; *Report on Economic Conditions of the South,* prepared for the President by the National Emergency Council (Washington, 1938), especially section 15, "Purchasing Power."

74. This resolution was cited by the present writer when he exposed the existence of peonage in Oglethorpe County, Georgia (the bailiwick of Representative Eugene Cox, then and now chairman of the key House Committee on Rules). Organized pressure, led by the Abolish Peonage Committee of Chicago, did produce some action in the course of about five years. See *New Masses,* May 28, 1940, pp. 9-11. During the late war, there were seven indictments and four convictions for peonage—see Florence Murray, "The Negro and Civil Liberties During World War II," *Social Forces* (1945), XXIV, p. 213; and J. G. Van Deusen, *The Black Man in White America* (Washington, 1944), pp. 18-19, for references to earlier cases. See also H. Powdermaker, *After Freedom* (N. Y., 1939), pp. 87-88.

75. See the anonymous pamphlet, *Lynching Goes Underground* (1940), sponsored by Senators Wagner and Capper and Representatives Gavagan and Fish; C. S. Johnson, *Growing Up in the Black Belt* (Washington, 1942), p. 5; J. D. Ames, *The Changing Character of Lynching* (Atlanta, 1942), p. 9. Myrdal is incorrect, too, in stating that "probably" more whites than Negroes were lynched in the South from 1830 to 1860 (532). On page 560 he omits "probably" and states this as a fact. The remark is based on the quite unreliable work of Frank Shay (*Judge Lynch,* N. Y., 1937, p. 63). The history of the use of lynching against unruly or rebellious slaves leads one to believe that most probably more Negroes than whites were lynched in the pre-Civil War generation. Actual figures are, of course, not available. For other authentic accounts of this pattern of Negro killing and beating, see J. Dollard, *op. cit.,* pp. 330-41; and A. Davis, B. Gardner, M. Gardner, *Deep South* (Chicago, 1941), p. 394.

76. See A. Bontemps and J. Conroy, *They Seek a City* (N. Y., 1946), p. 222; L. H. Bailey, "The Negro Automobile Worker," *The Journal of Political Economy* (1943), LI, pp. 418-22; R. C. Weaver, *op. cit.,* p. 63.

77. J. W. Johnson, *Negro Americans, What Now?* (N. Y., 1943), pp. 7-11. Thus on page 7 appears this: "Communism is com-

ing to be regarded as the infallible solution by an increasing number of us." As is typical, Myrdal contradicts himself, for on the same page as the "immunity" of the Negro from Marxism appears his "surprise" to see how that concept has taken hold of Negro intellectuals and professionals, and has influenced the Negro press. Strange immunity!

Further on (1401) Myrdal stoops to outright misrepresentation when he declares that at the Third National Convention of the National Negro Congress, held in Washington in 1940, "During Randolph's speech the Communists arranged a demonstration and walked out, leaving only a third of the audience when he finished talking." The present writer attended that convention and heard that sad speech in its entirety, and no such event as that mentioned by Myrdal occurred. His remarks, too, that the National Negro Congress, immediately with the election of Dr. Max Yergan to the presidency, in 1940, collapsed, is contrary to the truth, for from 1940 to 1941 the Congress had a period of very considerable growth. It did decline during the war years, but the assertion that it then was a "paper organization kept by the Communist Party" is in direct conflict with the facts. The present condition of that Congress is sufficient evidence of the falsity of Myrdal's final remark that it was dead—a somewhat premature burial!

78. G. B. Johnson, "The Stereotype of the American Negro," part I of Otto Klineberg, ed., *Characteristics of the American Negro* (Harper, N. Y., 1944).

79. Klineberg himself points this out in a footnote to Johnson's chapter (p. 17) citing N. Schoenfeld "An Experimental Study of Some Problems Relating to Stereotypes," *Archives of Psychology* (N. Y., 1942), No. 270. In that, the conclusion reached was that the "kernel of truth" explanation of stereotypes is false. In addition, see N. D. Humphrey, "The Stereotype and the Social Types of Mexican-American Youths," *Journal of Social Psychology* (1945), XXII, pp. 69-78 where the conclusion is that "discernible and empirically constructed types of Mexican youths diverge largely from the popular stereotypes of these youths."

80. This concept of "average Negro," uncritically accepted and frequently repeated by Myrdal, is contradicted by him at one point (392) where he states "that there are all kinds of Negroes as there are all kinds of whites," but this is submerged by the contrary dominant interpretation.

81. O. Klineberg, "Experimental Studies of Negro Personality" in Klineberg, ed., *op. cit.*, p. 138.

82. Julian H. Lewis, *op. cit.*, pp. 80-81, citing W. E. B. Du Bois, *The Negro* (N. Y., 1915). Lewis' work was known to and used by Myrdal.

83. This is admitted by Myrdal himself in another place (1213). See Lewis, *op. cit.*, pp. 92-94.

84. See the pamphlet *Negro Workers After the War* (N. Y., 1945); John A. Davis, *How Management Can Integrate Negroes in War Industries* (N. Y., 1942); *The Negro Worker* (American Management Assoc., N. Y.); E. R. Embree, *Brown Americans* (N. Y., 1943), p. 120.

85. We do not mean to deny that hypertension, as an illness, appears to be more common among Negroes than whites, as stated by J. H. Lewis, *op. cit.*, p. 292. A recent study, however, of Negro high school and college students resulted in "Negro secondary students . . . showing more emotional stability, less impulsiveness . . . [and] Negro college students . . . less emotional instability" than did whites. See E. Stainbrook and P. S. Siegel, "A Comparative Group Rorschach Study of Southern Negro and White High School and College Students," in *Journal of Psychology* (1944), XVII, pp. 107-15.

86. See O. Klineberg, ed., *op. cit.*, p. 35.

87. Thus, early tests by Stetson (1897), Ferguson (1916), and Sunne (1917) found Negroes getting equal or higher scores in the entire tests or in critical sections thereof. Tests by J. Peterson and L. Lanier (*Mental Measurement Monographs*, 1929, V, pp. 1-156), showed higher scores for whites in Nashville, very slightly higher in Chicago, and identical in New York. Practically identical scores were found by McAlpin in Washington in 1932 (*Journal of Negro Education,* I, pp. 44ff.), and Long had the same result there in 1934 (*ibid.*, III, pp. 205ff.). Note, too, the well-known test of 500 Negro youngsters in Los Angeles (1925), by W. W. Clark where the score achieved by them (median of 104.7) was slightly higher than that of the whites (*Education Research Bulletin,* Los Angeles City Schools, 1925). See also *The Black and White of Rejections for Military Service* (Montgomery, Ala., 1944), pp. 7-9.

88. An outstanding example of this, of course, is the result of the Army intelligence tests during the first World War. In those tests Northern Negroes from Pennsylvania, New York, Illinois, and Ohio achieved higher median scores than whites from Mississippi, Kentucky, Arkansas, and Georgia.

89. Specific documentation of these facts would cover almost the entire literature of educational psychology for the past fifteen

years. As examples see, Clark Foreman, *Environmental Factors in Negro Elementary Education* (N. Y., 1932); Otto Klineberg, *Race Differences* (N. Y., 1935); and the famous *39th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (Bloomington, Ill., 1940), Part I, Intelligence: Its Nature and Nurture.

90. This material is based on letters to the present writer from Col. S. M. Prouty, Acting Deputy Director, Office, Director of Military Training, Army Service Forces, dated 5 March and 18 March, 1946; Brig.-Gen. A. G. Trudeau, "Army Experiences and Problems of Negro Education," in *Education for Victory* (1945), III, pp. 13-16; articles by Paul S. Witty and S. Goldberg in *Elementary English Review* (1943), XX, pp. 306-11; *Journal of Educational Psychology* (1944), XXXV, pp. 82-90, 338-46; by S. Goldberg in *Journal of Clinical Psychology* (1945), I, pp. 118-26; N. Kaplan, in *Occupations* (1944), XXIII, pp. 74-76; Paul Witty, "New Evidence on the Learning Ability of the Negro," in *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* (1945), XL, pp. 401-04.

91. M. E. Shimberg, "An Investigation into the Validity of Norms with Special Reference to Urban and Rural Groups," *Archives of Psychology* (1929), No. 104. For an awareness of this problem of standardization see David Wechsler, *The Measurement of Adult Intelligence* (3rd edit., Baltimore, 1944), chapter 8. Of his own device, the Wechsler-Bellevue Scale, he writes (p. 107), ". . . we have eliminated the 'colored' vs. 'white' factor by admitting at the outset that our norms cannot be used for the colored population of the United States." Nevertheless, the test has been used in precisely this manner—see Solomon Machover, *Cultural and Racial Variations in Patterns of Intellect* (N. Y., 1943). Incidentally, Dr. Machover did his own testing, but declares he feels that though he is white this would not effect the scores made by Negro examinees. He says (p. 45) that he is supported in this because of a study by Canady showing "that the identity of tester and subject in respect to race does not effect the test results." The study by H. G. Canady, however (*The Journal of Negro Education,* 1936, V., pp. 202-19) showed that whites tested by a Negro *lost* an average of six points, while Negroes tested by a Negro *gained* an average of six points—results precisely the opposite of those described by Machover.

92. A. Binet, *Les Idées Modernes sur les Enfants* (Paris, 1909), pp. 141-46.

93. Stephen S. Colvin, "Principles Underlying the Construction and Use of Intelligence Tests," *The 21st Yearbook of the Na-*

tional Society for the Study of Education (Bloomington, Ill., 1922), pp. 19, 20, 23. Emphases in original.

94. Walter S. Neff, "Socio-economic Status and Intelligence," *Psychological Bulletin* (1938), XXXV, pp. 727-56. Emphases in original. For a critique of Neff, which does not refute his basic point, see L. Hollingworth, L. Terman, and M. Oden, "The Significance of Deviates," *39th Yearbook . . . op. cit.*, p. 48.

95 D. Wechsler, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

96. It is worth remembering, as Ruth Benedict has pointed out (*Race and Cultural Relations,* Washington, 1942, pp. 36-37), that early formulators of inherent inferiority of certain people conceived of this in terms of the inherent inferiority of the poor as compared to the rich. See, also, E. F. Heckscher, *Mercantilism* (London, 1935), II, pp. 153-68; E. S. Furniss, *The Position of the Laborer in a System of Nationalism* (Boston, 1920), chap. VI. This, of course, still exists in the thinking of the wealthy—see R. A. Brady, *Business as a System of Power* (N. Y., 1943), pp. 265-71.

97. J. Dewey, "Race Prejudice and Friction," *Chinese Political and Social Science Review* (Peking, 1924), VI, pp. 1-17.

98. Richard Wright, introduction for Drake & Cayton, *Black Metropolis.*

99. Richard Wright, *Black Boy* (Harpers, N. Y., 1944), p. 32.

100. Quoted material will be found in: H. Sabin Bagger, *See Here, Private Enterprise* (N. Y., 1945), pp. 119-20; Janet Flanner, in The *New Yorker,* October 13, 1945; N. Y. *Times,* March 24, 1946. See also, R. A. Brady, *op. cit.*, p. 269.

101. *The Autobiography of Lincoln Steffens* (Harcourt, Brace, N. Y., 1931), p. 759.

102. *Poetry,* December, 1945.

AMERICAN HISTORY

ESSAYS IN THE HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN NEGRO	Herbert Aptheker	$2.00
THE NEGRO IN AMERICAN HISTORY. Four booklets	Herbert Aptheker, Each	$0.15
THE RISE OF THE AMERICAN NATION	Francis Franklin	$2.00
THE STRUGGLE FOR AMERICAN FREEDOM	Herbert M. Morais	$2.25
THE CIVIL WAR IN THE UNITED STATES	Karl Marx and Frederick Engels	$2.50
RECONSTRUCTION: The Battle for Democracy	James S. Allen	$1.50
THE FIRST AMERICAN REVOLUTION	Jack Hardy	$0.75
FREDERICK DOUGLASS: Selections from His Writings	Edited by P. S. Foner	$0.35
THOMAS PAINE: Selections from His Writings	Edited by James S. Allen	$0.30
ABRAHAM LINCOLN: Selections from His Writings	Edited by P. S. Foner	$0.35
THE POPULIST MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES	Anna Rochester	$0.35
WILLIAM SYLVIS AND THE NATIONAL LABOR UNION	Charlotte Todes	$0.25
THADDEUS STEVENS	Elizabeth Lawson	$0.10
HARRIET TUBMAN: Negro Abolitionist	Earl Conrad	$0.15
WENDELL PHILLIPS	James J. Green	$0.15

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS
381 FOURTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

65